AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FOR THE CLERGY.

Vol. XXVIII.

"*Ut Ecclesia aedificationem accipiat.*"

1 Cor. 14 : 5.

PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

1903.

CONTENTS—VOL. XXVIII.

JANUARY.

FEBRUARY.

MARCH.

APRIL.

MAY.

JUNE.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVII).—JANUARY, 1903.—NO. 1.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.

ANCIENT tradition ascribes the authorship of the primitive Creed of the Church to the Apostles. Ever since the fifteenth century this tradition has been the object of much criticism at the hands mainly of men not of the household of the faith. To-day it is freely called in question even by Catholic scholars, among whom may be mentioned the Benedictine Baumer in Germany, the Benedictine Dom Morin in France, and the Barnabite Giovanni Semeria in Italy. The last-named, in a work fresh from the hands of the printer,[1] regards the received account of the origin of the Creed as legendary. He sets the old tradition aside, as not of a nature to win our belief on the score either of its antiquity or its universality, and follows Harnack in fixing upon the middle of the second century as the probable date on which our most ancient Symbol of Faith was formulated.

I propose, first, to review briefly the explicit testimony that we have as to the apostolic authorship of the Creed; next, to point out how the Discipline of the Secret was rigidly enforced and religiously observed in regard to the Creed; and, lastly, to consider the bearing of this fact on the question of its authorship.

I.

Between the latter half of the fourth century and the middle of the fifth, several writers of exceptional standing, in respect of their learning and their critical acumen, explicitly and categoric-

[1] Dogma, *Gerarchia e Culto nella Chiesa primitiva.* Roma: F. Pustet. 1902.

ally affirm the Creed to be of Apostolic origin. Chief among these are St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, the Presbyter Rufinus, and St. Leo the Great. The last-named calls the Creed the "Catholic and Apostolic Symbol,"[2] speaks of it as the Rule of Faith "which has come down to us with the authority of apostolic institution,"[3] and puts those who "contradict the Symbol instituted by the holy Apostles" in the same category with men who deny the doctrine of the Incarnation.[4] The testimony of St. Ambrose is contained in these words: "Let the Symbol of the Apostles be believed, which the Roman Church ever has in its keeping and preserves inviolate."[5] St. Jerome bears witness that "the Symbol of our Faith and Hope, which has been handed down to us from the Apostles, is not written with ink on paper, but graved on the fleshly tablets of the heart."[6]

The testimony of Rufinus, who writes towards the close of the fourth century, is, though no whit clearer or more categorical, fuller and much more specific. The others make but a passing allusion to the Symbol; Rufinus has a whole treatise upon it.[7] At the outset of his commentary (for such it is) on the Creed, he deals with its origin. He tells us how the faithful in his day held it as a tradition handed down from their forefathers in the faith, that the Apostles, after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them, and before they dispersed to preach the Gospel throughout the world, being gathered together, composed the Symbol to serve as the norm of their teaching in the after time; how they collaborated in drawing up this brief outline (*indicium*) or index of the truths they were about to preach, and agreed to deliver it to believers as their rule or standard; also, how they gave it the name of Symbol, a name, observes our author, which signifies at once a putting together or collaborating and a distinctive mark or badge, whereby the preachers of the true faith, as well as true believers, may be known. He adds the significant words: "Therefore they delivered these [truths embodied in the Symbol], not to be written on paper or parchment, but to be retained in the hearts of believers, so that it might be certain that nobody had learned them

[2] Serm. 24, c. 6.
[3] Serm. 62, c. 2.
[4] Serm. 96, c. 1.
[5] Apud Migne, tom. 16, col. 1125.
[6] *Ib.*, tom. 23, col. 380.
[7] *Comment. in Symbol. Apost.* (Apud Migne, tom. 21.).

from writings, which are known at times to fall into the hands of unbelievers, but from the tradition of the Apostles."

According to Rufinus the Apostles not only composed the Creed but gave it the name of Symbol, which it still bears. Harnack has not been able to discover any trace of the term symbol as a designation of the Creed in the writings of the first two centuries. It would seem to have been for the first time employed in this sense by St. Cyprian. But this should not be held to weaken the force of the testimony of Rufinus to the fact, or rather the tradition, of the Apostolic authorship, which is, after all, the only matter of importance. The learned presbyter of Aquileia cannot be supposed to mean that the Apostles used the very word *Symbolum* itself (from the Greek *συμβολον*), but rather the equivalent for that word in their own language; the more so that, as he expressly tells us, they did not deliver the Creed in writing, but by word of mouth. In any case, it is far from clear that he is citing the circumstances of the name as part of the old tradition. Nor is there anything in the text or context of the passage to warrant Father Semeria in imputing to Rufinus the statement that the Creed was composed by the Apostles on the very day of Pentecost.[8] On the contrary, his *Decessuri igitur* implies it to have been the mind of Rufinus that the Creed was not drawn up by the Apostles till the eve of their dispersion.

In the beginning of his exposition of the Symbol, Rufinus notes the fact that the text is not exactly the same in all the Churches. Thus, the Eastern Churches profess belief in "One God the Father Almighty." In the Creed of the Roman Church, as in that of Aquileia, the word "one" is wanting. Nor does the Old Roman Creed contain the addition, "maker of heaven and earth," found, with variations, in the Creeds of the Eastern Churches. Again, the words "He descended into hell," found in the Creed of Aquileia, are wanting in the Roman as well as in the Eastern Creed. Rufinus, however, observes that the truth expressed in these words is implied in the words "was buried," that precede; for as the body went down into the grave so the soul went down into the place where the souls of the faithful departed awaited the coming of the Redeemer. Belief in "the communion

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 321.

of Saints" is not expressed in any of the earlier forms, even in that which St. Augustine expounds in his homilies.[9] But this, too, is implied in the preceding article, "the holy Church." Finally, the words, "life everlasting," with which the Creed now closes, though found in some at least of the Eastern formularies, are only implied in the words, "resurrection of the flesh," which invariably form the conclusion of the Western Creed up to and including the time of St. Augustine.

The foregoing, with some other slight differences in the wording, constitute the variations in the formula of the Apostolic Faith which served as the Baptismal Creed in the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. Variations, as they are, apparent rather than real, in the words, but not in the underlying ideas, they do but witness to the unity of the primitive and archetypal form of the Christian Confession of Faith. But where, if anywhere, was this archetypal form preserved? Rufinus testifies that in "divers Churches" words were added to the Creed originally delivered to the faithful. He agrees with St. Ambrose in affirming that the Roman Church ever kept the Symbol of the Apostles inviolate. "And this," he adds, "I believe to be owing to the fact than no heresy every had its origin there." For additions were made elsewhere, as he proceeds to point out—not indeed from without but from within, not by way of putting forward a new truth, but by way of bringing into clearer light the old—to meet the rising heresies.[10]

At the close of the fourth century, therefore, and the beginning of the fifth, the Creed delivered to the class of catechumens known as *competentes* was the self-same, in substance and meaning, throughout the whole Christian world. And of this Creed Rufinus and Jerome and Ambrose and Leo the Great declare the Apostles to have been the authors, or at any rate declare this to have been the received tradition in their day. Whatever is to be thought of this tradition, one thing is clear, and ought to be kept

[9] *In traditione Symboli*, Serm. 212, 213, 214.

[10] It is interesting to note that Dr. Kattenbusch, in the second volume of his monumental work on the Symbol of the Apostles, published two years ago, traces all Eastern Creeds of the fourth century to one archetype in the Old Roman Creed, though he does so only as a working hypothesis. See the *Church Quarterly Review* for October, pp. 216–221.

clearly in view by anyone who really wishes to reach the truth in this matter: the tradition in question stands upon an altogether different footing, and should be kept quite separate from the legend which, in the after time, grew out of it, or rather was woven around it, to the effect that each of the Apostles contributed a distinct article to the Creed, Peter contributing the first and Mathias the twelfth and last. This incongruous appendage to the old tradition is first met with in a sermon long believed to have been written by St. Augustine, but now known to be the work of some anonymous scribe at a later date. Its legendary character is sufficiently attested by its spurious origin. It is true that St. Leo the Great, in his epistle to Pulcheria (c. 4), speaks of the Symbol as being *duodecim apostolorum totidem signata sententiis*, but this should not be taken to mean more than it says, to wit, that the Creed is stamped with the seal of Apostolic authorship by the fact of its containing as many articles as there were members of the Apostolic College from the beginning. As a matter of fact, the words *vitam aeternam*, which constitute the article ascribed to Mathias by the author of the sermon above referred to, were not part of the Creed known to St. Augustine.

The legend has been relegated, and with reason, to the limbo of vain things fondly invented. But what of the tradition? Must it, too, go the same way? That it must appears to be the verdict of what many look upon to-day as the court of last resort in all questions of this kind—the school of historical criticism. Before accepting the verdict as final, it will be well to inquire whether the method by which it has been reached is such as would be likely, in this instance, to lead those who employ it into the truth. We have to consider whether the Symbol of Faith known as the Apostles' Creed came under the Discipline of the Secret, and whether, if it did come under the Discipline of the Secret, this does not effectually bar all movement looking to the discovery of its authorship along the path trodden by historical criticism.

II.

One need but glance into the works of the early Christian writers to see how strictly the Discipline of the Secret was enforced in the first centuries. Our Lord had forbidden His dis-

ciples to cast their pearls before swine (Matt. 7: 6). St. Paul would have "the wisdom of God, a wisdom which is hidden," spoken "in a mystery" and only "among the perfect"[11]—the *competentes* of a later day. It was only after persecution ceased and the old pagan Empire of the Romans was converted and baptized in the person of Constantine, that the *disciplina arcani* was gradually relaxed. That it extended to the Symbol, and held it fast even in the days of St. Augustine, is a fact that can be established on unimpeachable testimony. We have, first of all, the witness of Augustine himself. Over and over again he repeats in his homilies that the Symbol is not given in writing. "Nobody," he says, "writes the Symbol that it may be read."[12] When delivering it to the catechumens a week or two before their baptism, he warns them: "In no wise are you to write down the words of the Symbol in order to commit them to memory. You are to learn them by ear (*audiendo*); and even after you have learned them, you are not to write them, but to retain them in memory and ponder over them." He goes on to say that everything which they are about to hear in the Symbol is contained in Scripture, but that, as gathered together and reduced to a certain formula, it is not lawful to write it (*non licet scribi*). This he conceives to have been foreshadowed in those words of the Old Testament: "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, said the Lord; I will give my law in their bowels, and in their hearts will I write it." "In token of this," he adds, "the Symbol is learned by ear; nor is it written on tablets, or any kind of material, but on the heart."[13] In the next homily but one,[14] when he comes to the point where the delivery (*traditio*) of the Symbol took place, he says: "These are the words that you

[11] 1 Cor. 2: 6, 7.

[12] *De Symb. ad Catech.* (Apud Migne, tom. 6, col. 627.) Migne decides in favor of the genuineness of this homily on intrinsic grounds. But in homilies on the Creed, which are unquestionably St. Augustine's, the "resurrection of the flesh" is the last article; in this one, on the other hand, the words "in vitam aeternam" are cited as part of the Creed. This would seem to cast a doubt on its genuineness. Neither in the homilies certainly genuine, nor in his *De Fide et Symbolo*, nor in his *Enchiridion de Fide*, etc., does St. Augustine cite as part of the Symbol the words in question.

[13] *In traditione Symb.*, Ib. tom., col. 1060.

[14] *Ib.*, col. 1066.

are faithfully to learn by heart and recite from memory,"[15] that is, on the day set for their baptism. The Saint adds, within brackets, the following words, which he set down when he first put the sermon in writing: ("After this preface the whole Symbol is to be given out, no word of comment being interspersed therewith. *I believe in God the Father Almighty*, and the other words that follow. It is not the custom, as you know, to put the Symbol in writing; which being said, the following discourse is to be added.") Whence it appears that St. Augustine scrupled to write the words of the Creed even in the manuscript of his own sermons. All this tallies with the testimony of St. Jerome, already quoted, that the Symbol of Faith, "handed down from the Apostles, is not written with ink on paper, but engraved on the fleshly tablets of the heart;" and with the words of Rufinus, also cited above, that the truths contained in the Creed formulated by those whom Christ first sent to teach and baptize all nations were not delivered to men to be written on paper or parchment, but to be preserved in the hearts of believers, so that it might be known for certain that "no one had learned them from books, which at times fall into the hands of unbelievers, but from the tradition of the Apostles."

We will now turn to the Eastern Church. Our first witness shall be St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who became Bishop of that ancient See about the middle of the fourth century. His testimony is so explicit, and so much to the purpose, that it must be

[15] To know the Symbol by heart was to the early Christians a matter of life and death. In a letter "to the aged Alypius" (Tom. 2, col. 1012) St. Augustine relates how a pagan of the name of Dioscorus had a dearly loved daughter whose life was despaired of, and how, upon his taking a vow to become a Christian, she was restored to health. Failing to keep his vow, he was struck blind. All at once he bethought that his blindness was a judgment of God upon him for having broken his vow. A second time he vows he will perform his first vow if he recovers his sight. This he does, and is duly baptized, but has not learned the Symbol by heart, alleging as excuse that he is not able. He is now struck with paralysis, which extends even to his tongue. Admonished in a dream that this has happened to him because of his not having recited the Symbol from memory, he makes a confession to this effect in writing, learns the Symbol by heart, and is freed at length from all his infirmities. Modern incredulity may smile at the childlike simplicity of him who tells this story. But the great Bishop of Hippo, were he still with us, could say, as Newman said under like circumstances: Hippoclides doesn't care.

given at length in his own words. He is addressing the class of *competentes* on the eve of their baptism:

"But take thou and hold, as a learner, and in profession, that faith only which is now delivered to thee by the Church, and is fenced round out of all Scripture. For since all cannot read the Scriptures, but some as being unlearned, others by business, are hindered from knowledge (of them), in order that the soul may not perish from want of instruction, we comprehend the whole doctrine of the faith in a few sentences. This I wish you to remember in the very phrase, and to rehearse it with all diligence amongst yourselves, not writing it on paper, but graving it by memory on your heart; being on your guard in your exercise, lest haply a catechumen should overhear the things delivered to you. This I wish you to have as a provision by the way during the whole period of life, and besides this never to receive any other."—*Catech.* v, n. 12.[16]

It is very plain from this that every precaution was taken lest the Symbol should be committed to writing, or become public property. It was withheld even from catechumens of the first and second grade.

St. Basil, a contemporary of St. Cyril, witnesses for the Church in Cappadocia. "Of the dogmas and teachings preserved in the Church," he writes, "we have some from the doctrine committed to writing, and some we have received, transmitted to us in a secret manner, from the tradition of the Apostles; both these have the same force in forming religion (*i. e.* piety); and no one will gainsay either of these, no one, that is, who has the least experience of the ecclesiastical laws."[17] Again: "Dogma is one thing, and preaching another; for the former is guarded in silence, while preachings are openly proclaimed."[18] That he means by "dogma" especially the Symbol appears from the words he uses a little further on. "The very confession of faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," he asks, "from what written records have we it?"

In Clement of Alexandria we have a witness whose testimony dates over a century and a half further back than that of any writer hitherto cited, for he flourished in the latter half of the

[16] *Faith of Catholics*, vol. i, p. 51.
[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 418.
[18] *Ib.*, p. 421.

second century. His references to the Symbol are not so explicit as are those of the other writers; the Discipline of the Secret was even more rigorously enforced in his day; yet no one who reads his words can doubt that the Symbol is in his mind. He tells us how he was himself personally acquainted with men who "preserved the true tradition of the blessed doctrine, directly from Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, the holy Apostles, having received it in succession, the son from the father."[19] He calls it "the celebrated and venerable rule of tradition, commencing from the origin of the universe," which seems to point to the profession of faith in the "Creator of heaven and earth" contained in the first article of the Creed. He speaks of it as knowledge "which has come down, transmitted without writing to a few by successions from the Apostles," and distinguishes between it and the apostolic doctrine contained in Scripture, saying: "For as the doctrine, so also was the tradition of all the Apostles, one."

Now, this "blessed tradition," which was handed down orally from the Apostles, and which, being a tradition of "doctrine," must at the least have included the Symbol, whatever else it may have included, he affirms to have been guarded as a secret. He conceives it to be "the delineation of a soul that loves, to guard the blessed traditions so that it may not escape." He says that, "Secret things, like God, are entrusted, not to writing but to oral teaching," with much more to the same purpose.

Let me make an end of citation with a longish passage from the *Stromata:*

"Some of these secret things I deliberately pass by, making a selection after reflection, being afraid to commit to writing things which we are upon our guard even to speak about; not from any envy, for that is not lawful, but from fear lest those who may meet with them, taking them in a wrong sense, might fall into error, and we should thus be found to be giving, as they say who use proverbs, a sword to a child , . . There are some things which my writing will obscurely indicate; and on some things it will dwell; others it will only name, and will attempt, while concealing, yet to declare, and though hiding to manifest, and though silent to point out; and it will lay before the readers the dogmas that have been taught by cele-

[19] *Op. cit.*, pp. 391–395.

brated heresies, and will oppose to them all that ought to be premised to the interior contemplation of knowledge, which will be proceeded in by us according to the celebrated and venerable rule of tradition, commencing from the origin of the universe . . ."—*Strom.*, I, i, pp. 321–325.

There has been now produced evidence enough and to spare that the Creed of the early Church was hedged about and jealously guarded by the Discipline of the Secret;[20] that the early Christian writers religiously refrained from reproducing it in their works, and even from putting it at all in writing. But consider how fraught with significance is this and how effectually it serves to discredit the method of historical criticism, so-called, as applied to the question of the authorship of the Creed. Your ingenious critic, with his vast apparatus of learning, with an industry and patience in research beyond all praise and worthy of all emulation, ransacks the writings of sub-apostolic and early times for the Symbol, and declares he can not find it. No marvel that he cannot find it: he seeks the living among the dead.[21] The Creed is in the heart and on the lips of the Church of the living God; he is looking for some fossil remains of the casket that enclosed it where it might conceivably be, but isn't; for, to cite once more the words of St. Jerome: "The Symbol of our Faith and Hope, handed down to us from the Apostles, is not written with ink on paper, but graved on the fleshly tablets of the heart." To the weary and sore-perplexed critic, peering into ancient tomes, grop-

[20] The Discipline of the Secret arose from several causes. In times of persecution the Christians were afraid to speak openly about their worship and doctrine, for fear that their doing so would expose them to further injury and interruption. They regarded truth, too, as a sacred deposit, and they shrank from communicating it to those who would misunderstand it or laugh it to scorn. It was not till after the sixth century that the need for the old reserve passed away. Cf. *A Catholic Dictionary*, art. "Discipline of the Secret."

[21] To the searcher for the Symbol among the literary remains of the early ages, we might almost say as the angels said to those who sought in the sepulchre for the Lord of the Symbol—*surrexit, non est hic.* For those in whose minds and hearts the Symbol came from the Apostles down to later generations have mounted to that "house of many mansions" where Faith is merged in Vision. "When we reach that place where we shall reign," says St. Augustine, in his fifty-eighth homily, "there will be no more need of our saying the Symbol; we shall see God; God Himself will be our Vision, and the vision of God will be the reward of this our Faith."

ing in the twilight of those early times, seeking in vain the source whence came the Symbol, the words of Augustine and Jerome and Rufinus, of Basil and Cyril and Clement, should have been as the legend on the sign-post to give timely warning of *No Thoroughfare.* But he heeded not the warning; he had no eyes for it; he would plod his way, groping ever, till at length he has fetched up in a blind alley. For this is just where its failure to find other than an anonymous author for the great Creed of Christendom has left historical criticism—in a cul-de-sac. But of this and other phases of the same subject more at another time.

ALEXANDER MACDONALD.

St. Francis Xavier College,
Antigonish, N. S.

DE PARTICIPATIONE FACULTATUM APOSTOLICARUM.

QUANDO quidem non omnes facultates Apostolicae, Episcopo concessae, ab ipso Episcopo semper exerceri possunt, rectissime solent Doctores inquirere quonam modo ab aliis quoque facultates huiusmodi valeant executioni mandari.

Cumprimis quod illas spectat facultates, quas foliis impressis sive "formulis" per *S. Congregationem de Propaganda Fide* accipere solent Episcopi aliique locorum Ordinarii,[1] certum exploratumque erat, neminem, neque ipsum quidem Vicarium Generalem hisce potiri vel uti potuisse nisi quatenus per Episcopum cuique suum communicatum subdelegatumve fuisset.

Quae quidem communicatio vel subdelegatio cum frequentissimis esset obnoxia dubiis atque incommodis, S. Sedes Apostolica superiori hac tempestate Vicariis Generalibus viam aperuit stravitque planiorem et securiorem, qua facultatibus, ab Apostolica Sede Episcopis habitualiter concessis, ipsi quoque absque ulla Episcopi communicatione aut subdelegatione perfruerentur atque uterentur.

Immo hodie obtinet haec regula generalis, quam proponendum

[1] Episcopis Americanis a S. Sede concedi solent facultates (*a*), Ordinariae, scilicet quae uni cuique Episcopo ordinarie delegantur; (*b*), *extraordinariae:* atque illae quidem in Form. I, hae autem in Form. C. D. et E. Porro facultates Form. I, C. et D. ad *decennium*, Form. E, pro numero casuum conceduntur, cf. Jos. Putzer, Comm. in facult. apostol. ed. 3ia 1893, Neo-Eboraci, Benziger Fratres.

hisce suscepimus et ex ipsis S. Congregationis Supremae S. Officii decisis comprobandam veluti *novissimi iuris adagium:*

In facultatibus Apostolicis habitualibus quod valet Episcopus, id valet Vicarius Generalis, nisi ius divinum obstet.

Ac sedulo quidem praenotetur scripsisse die 20 Februarii 1888 Secretarium S. Officii ex mandato Sanctitatis Suae ad Ordinarios locorum: [2] .

"1. Dispensationes matrimoniales omnes in posterum committendas esse vel *oratorum Ordinario* vel *Ordinario loci.*

"2. Appellatione Ordinarii venire Episcopos, Administratores seu Vicarios Apostolicos, Praelatos seu Praefectos habentes iurisdictionem cum territorio separato, eorumque Officiales [3] seu Vicarios in spiritualibus Generales, et sede vacante Vicarium Capitularem vel legitimum Administratorem." [4]

Quo praenotato, ecce decisa S. Officii, quibus thesis nostra probatur.

(a) *Feria IV, 24 Novembris 1897.*

"In Congregatione Gen. S. Rom. Univ. Inquis. habita ab E.mis ac R.mis DD. Card. in rebus fidei et morum Gen. Inquisitoribus, iidem E.mi Patres, rerum temporumque adiunctis mature perpensis, decernendum censuerunt: Supplicandum SS.mo ut declarare seu statuere dignetur, facultates omnes speciales[5], habitualiter[6] a S. Sede Episcopis aliorumque locorum Ordinariis concessas, non suspendi vel desinere ob eorum mortem vel a munere cessationem, sed ad successores Ordinarios transire ad formam et in terminis decreti a Sup. hac. Cong. editi die 20 Februarii 1888 quoad dispensationes matrimoniales.

[2] Nota *locorum:* caeteros enim Ordinarios, v. c. Superiores generales vel provinciales Regularium haec non spectant. Nihilo minus ex mox dicendis patebit Summum Pontificem decisa in casu nostro ad hos quoque Ordinarios postea benigne extendisse.

[3] *Officiales:* quod hoc loco idem est ac Vicarii in spiritualibus generales.

[4] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xx, p. 544.

[5] *Speciales:* nam *generales* per se transire planum erat.

[6] *Habitualiter:* videlicet quae sive ad revocationem sive pro tempore determinato sive pro certo casuum numero conceduntur: ita ut *hoc loco* sint exceptae illae tantum facultates, quae pro casu quopiam determinato committi saepe videmus *Ordinario* (uti omnes dispensationes matrimoniales): quare et hisce utitur Vicarius Generalis.

Insequenti vero feria VI die 26 Novembris 1897, in solita audientia R. P. D. Assessori S. O. impertita, facta de his omnibus SS.mo D. N. D. Leoni Div. Prov. PP. XIII relatione, Sanctitas Sua Emorum Patrum resolutionem approbavit, atque ita perpetuis futuris temporibus servandum mandavit, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.[7]

J. CARD. MANCINI, *S. R. et U. Inq. Notarius.*

Unde amodo concedere facultates *durante munere*, id quod fieri solebat v. c. Vicariis Capitularibus, plane videbatur esse superfluum, atque adeo statuit idem S. Officium :

(b) *Feria IV, die 20 Aprilis 1898.*

Postquam per Decretum huius Supremae Sacrae Congregationis in Fer. IV die 24 Novembris 1897 declaratum fuit facultates omnes speciales habitualiter a S. Sede Episcopis aliisque locorum Ordinariis concessas non suspendi eorum morte vel cessatione a munere, sed ad successores Ordinarios extendi, ad formam Decreti S. Officii Fer. IV diei 20 Februarii 1888 pro dispensationibus matrimonialibus; propositum fuit eidem huic S. Congregationi dubium, utrum expediat in posterum eliminare facultates *durante munere*, quae ut plurimum Vicariis Capitularibus conceduntur.

Porro in Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis habita ab Em.is ac R.mis DD. Cardinalibus in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitoribus Generalibus, praefato dubio diligenter expenso, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem E.mi ac R.mi Patres rescribendum mandarunt :

Clausulam durante munere *esse supprimendam et in ceteris standum formae Decreti iam lati die 20 Februarii 1888 num. 1 et 2, at iuxta modum idest :*

" 1°. Facultates omnes habituales in posterum committendas esse Ordinariis locorum."

" 2°. Appellatione *Ordinariorum* venire Episcopos, Administratores seu Vicarios Apostolicos, Praelatos seu Praefectos habentes iurisdictionem cum territorio separato, eorumque Officiales seu Vicarios in spiritualibus generales, et sede vacante Vicarium Capitularem vel legitimum Administratorem."

[7] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxx, pag. 627.

Subsequenti vero Feria VI, die 22 eiusdem mensis Aprilis 1898, in solita audientia R.P.D. Assessori impertita, facta his omnibus SS.mo D. N. Leoni Div. Prov. PP. XIII relatione, SS.mus resolutionem E.morum Patrum approbavit, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.[8]

J. Card. Mancini, *S. R. et U. T. Notarius.*

Quae quidem S. Officii ordinatio cum *futurum* tantum tempus respiceret (*in posterum committendas*) nullamque videretur exercere vim retroactivam, iure merito quaesitum est de tempore *praeterito*, ita:

(c) *Feria IV, die 23 Junii 1898.*

Suprema haec Congregatio in Fer. IV die 24 Nov. 1897[9] decrevit in facultatibus Episcopis *concedendis* clausulam *durante munere* esse supprimendam et in caeteris standum formae Decreti iam lati die 20 Februarii 1888 n. 1°, et 2°, at iuxta modum idest: "1°. Facultates omnes habituales in posterum committendas esse Ordinariis locorum; 2°. Appellatione *Ordinariorum* venire Episcopos, Administratores seu Vicarios Apostolicos, Praelatos, seu Praefectos habentes iurisdictionem cum territorio separato, eorumque Officiales seu Vicarios in spiritualibus generales, et sede vacante Vicarium Capitularem vel legitimum administratorem." Hinc propositum fuit eidem huic S. Congregationi dubium: *Utrum concessiones iam factae antecedenter Episcopis ab Apostolica Sede, intelligi debeant in sensu praefati Decreti.*

Porro in Congregatione Generali S.R.et U.Inquisitionis habita ab E.mis DD. Cardinalibus, in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitoribus Generalibus, praefato dubio diligenter expenso, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem E.mi ac R.mi Patres rescribendum mandarunt:

Declaratio S. Officii, facta circa facultates concedendas, vi Decreti Fer. IV dei 24 Novembris 1897,[10] *extendatur ad facultates iam antecedenter concessas, facto verbo cum Sanctissimo.*

[8] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxx, pag. 702.

[9] Sic reapse legitur in variis foliis periodicis, ut *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxxi, pag. 120; *il Monitore Ecclesiastico*, tom. x, 2, 101; *le Canoniste contemporain*, tom. 31, pag. 731. Sed est error manifestus, nam legi debuerat: Feria IV, die 20 Aprilis 1898; cf. supra: (b).

[10] Vide not. 9.

Subsequenti vero Sabbato die 25 [11] eiusdem mensis Junii 1898, in solita audientia R.P.D. Assessori impertita, facta de his omnibus, SS.mo D.no Nostro Leoni Div. Prov. PP. XIII relatione, SS.mus resolutionem Emorum Patrum approbavit contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

J. CARD. MANCINI, *S.R. et U.I. Not.*

Tametsi quaestio de *delegandis* facultatibus ab Apostolica Sede concessis hoc loco non moveatur, ne tamen eam praeteriisse proindeque duo decreta mox alleganda perperam intellexisse videamur, in mentem duximus revocandum illud iuris canonici: *delegatus Papae potest subdelegare.*

Nam quatenus *Vicarius Generalis*, sicut Episcopus ipse, ex supra allatis S. Officii decisionibus facultatum Apostolicarum habitualium Ordinario concessarum *de iure particeps* est, eatenus de iure *delegatus* est *Papae* dicendus: unde *subdelegare potest* et ipse sed subdelegari iam non potest.

Sed quatenus Vicarius Generalis facultatum Apostolicarum *de iure particeps non est*, eatenus poterit, sicut alii presbyteri, ab Episcopo suo *subdelegari.* Hinc si quae, post Decreta hucusque allata, concessa sit facultas Apostolica *non Ordinario* (id quod voluit S. Sedes ex Decreto S. Officii diei 20 Aprilis 1898 supra allegato ordinarie in posterum fieri) *sed nominatim Episcopo*, Vicarius Generalis non de iure particeps esset, sed particeps fieri poterat per communicationem subdelegationemve Episcopi tantum. Id diserte supponebat ipsum S. Officium ita:

(d) *Feria IV, die 14 Decembris 1898.*

Huic Supremae S.R. et U. Inquisitioni propositum fuit enodandum sequens dubium:

"An possit Episcopus dioecesanus subdelegare, absque speciali concessione, suis Vicariis Generalibus, aut aliis Ecclesiasticis, generali modo, vel saltem pro casu particulari, facultates ab Apostolica Sede sibi ad tempus delegatas."

Porro in Congregatione Generali ab E.mis DD. Cardinalibus in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitoribus Generalibus habita, maturrime praedicto dubio expenso, praehabitoque RR.DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE. ac RR. Patres respondendum mandarunt:

[11] Sic.

Affirmative, dummodo id in facultatibus non prohibeatur. neque subdelegandi ius pro aliquibus tantum coarctetur: in hoc enim casu servanda erit adamussim forma Rescripti.

Sequenti vero Feria VI die 16 eiusdem mensis et anni, in audientia a SS. D.N. Leone Div. Prov. PP. XIII R.P.D. Assessori impertita, SS.mus D.N. resolutionem EE. et RR. Patrum approbavit.[12]

J. Can. Mancini, *S.R. et U. Inquis. Notarius.*

(e) Cum insuper dubitatum fuerit, an quod praefatum Decretum statuit de *Episcopo dioecesano*, intelligendum etiam sit de Vicariis, Praefectis et Administratoribus Apostolicis iurisdictionem ordinariam cum territorio separato habentibus, SS. D.N. in audientia Feriae V, die 23 Martii 1899 referente R.P.D. Adsessore S.O., respondit: Affiirmative.[13]

Itaque quaerenti an Vicarius Generalis facultatum Apostolicarum *nominatim Episcopo* habitualiter concessarum *de iure particeps* existat, sedulo distinguendum: Si facultas in casu sit concessa *ante* d. 23 Junii 1898, *negative*, sed potest subdelegari.

Sed et hunc limitem vicariae potestatis idem S. Officium mox removit. Nam quaesitum et responsum est ita:

(f) *B.me Pater*, Vicarius Generalis N.N., ad pedes S.V. provolutus, humillime exponit: per Decretum d. 20 Aprilis 1898 S. Officium declaravit, facultates omnes habituales in posterum committendas esse Ordinariis locorum, et appellatione *Ordinariorun* venire Episcopos, Administratores seu Vicarios Apostolicos, Vicarios in spiritualibus generales, etc.

Porro Decreto d. 23 Iunii 1898 idem S. Officium edixit, declarationem suam, factam circa facultates *concedendas* vi Decreti diei 24 Novembris 1897[14] esse extendendam ad facultates iam *antecedenter concessas.*

[12] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxxi, pag. 635. Concordat ius commune: c. si *prodebilitate*. c. *pastorali. de off. del.*; c. *cum causam de appell.*; Const. *Apostolicum minist.* 30 Maii 1753, ibi: "Vicarius Apostolicus, in hoc facultatum genere, specialis S. Sedis Delegati personam gerit, cui liberum est subdelegare nedum ex communi iure, verum etiam ex singulari auctoritate illi demandata." Multa namque conceduntur *ab homine* quae iam erant *a iure* concessa.

[13] Ex Arch. *S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.*

[14] *Cf.* supra annotat. 9., et *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxxii, pag. 225, ubi recte legitur d. 20 Aprilis 1898.

Jam vero quaeritur, an facultates *post* Decretum diei 20 Aprilis 1898 consessas vel concedendas, *non* quidem *Ordinario*, sed *nominatim Episcopo*, sint nihilominus intelligendae in sensu memorati Decreti.[15]

Feria IV, die 5 Septembris 1900.

In Congregatione Generali S.R. et U. Inquisitionis ab E.mis et R.mis DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, exposito praedicto dubio, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE. ac RR. Patres rescribendum mandarunt: *Affirmative.*

Ex deductis itaque, quod facultatum Apostolicarum habitualium participationem spectat—

Constat 1°. Vicario in spiritualibus generali hodie de *iure* competere quae antehac ex solo Episcopi sui communicatione vel subdelegatione accipere poterat: videlicet participationem et usum omnium facultatum Apostolicarum, Episcopo suo, sive sub nomine Ordinarii, sive sub nomine Episcopi N.N., sive sub nomine N.N. Episcopi, habitualiter concessarum vel concedendarum; nec refert utrum concessio sit ad tempus vel ad revocationem an vero pro certo numero casuum; nullaque proinde Vicario praefato opus esse communicatione aut subdelegatione ex parte Episcopi sui.

Constat 2°. Episcopum suo Vicario in spiritualibus generali haudquaquam posse adimere aut coarctare participationem usumve facultatum Apostolicarum habitualiter concessarum, *quamdiu ipse Vicarius generalis in suo munere permanserit.*

Constat 3°. Vicarium in spiritualibus generalem, quia est *delegatus Papae*, facultates supra memoratas tam modo generali quam pro casu particulari posse subdelegare: dummodo id in facultatibus, idest ab ipsa S. Sede, non prohibeatur neque subdelegandi ius pro aliquibus tantum coarctetur: in hoc enim casu servanda erit adamussim forma Rescripti. *Nota:* limitationem *nisi obstet ius divinum* adiectam esse, quia Vicarius generalis charactere episcopali non insignitus, *iure divino* in iis quae sunt ordinis episcopalis impos est.

[15] Ex sermone Italo: *Cf.* il *Monitore Ecclesiastico*, an. 25, pag. 292; Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxxiii, pag. 225.

Ut quaedam supra adnotata clarius patescant subiicimus textum dubii et responsi S. Officii:

(g) *B.me Pater*,—Decreto S. R. et U. Inquisitionis die 24 Novembris 1897 statuitur: "facultates omnes speciales, *habitualiter* a Sancta Sede Episcopis aliorumque locorum Ordinariis concessas, non suspendi vel desinere ob eorum mortem vel a munere cessationem, sed ad successores Ordinarios transire ad formam et in terminis decreti a Suprema hac Congregatione editi die 20 Februarii 1888 quoad dispensationes matrimoniales."

Verumtamen infrascriptus Vicarius Capitularis, sede vacante Dioeceseos N. N., ad omne dubium tollendum pro suae conscientiae tranquillitate, ad Sanctitatis Vestrae pedes humiliter provolutus postulat ut declarare dignetur:

I. Utrum sub illis verbis *facultates omnes speciales* habitualiter *a Sancta Sede Episcopis aliorumque locorum Ordinariis concessas*, comprehendantur facultates omnes speciales a Sancta Sede Ordinariis concessae, quibus utuntur quoties voluerint, licet ad praefinitum tempus; cuiusmodi sunt facultates *de Poenitentiaria* dictae, reductionis missarum etc.

II. Utrum facultas benedicendi et delegandi ad sacra paramenta benedicenda, quae Episcopis fuerit concessa, transeat etiam ob eorum mortem vel a munere cessationem ad successorem Vicarium Capitularem, quamvis Episcopali dignitate non insignitum.

III. Utrum sub iisdem verbis *facultates omnes speciales* habitualiter *a Sancta Sede Episcopis . . . concessas* comprehendantur etiam facultates, quibus dumtaxat uti valent pro determinato casuum numero, ut sunt facultates dispensandi a sacrae ordinationis titulo pro definito ordinandorum numero.

IV. Et quatenus ad aliquid horum negative, quaenam sit interpretatio illius adverbii *habitualiter*. Et Deus, etc.

Feria IV, die 3 Maii 1899.

In Congregatione Generali ab E.mis et R.mis DD. Cardinalibus in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitoribus Generalibus habita, propositis suprascriptis dubiis, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE, ac. RR. Patres respondendum mandarunt:

Ad I, II, et III Affirmative.

Ad IV Provisum in praecedentibus.

Sequenti vero feria VI, die 5 eiusdem mensis et anni, in audientia a SS. D. N. Leone Div. Prov. PP. XIII R.P.D. Assessori impertita, SS.mus D. N. resolutionem EE. et RR. Patrum approbavit.[16]

J. Card. Mancini, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius.*

Denique memoratu dignum videtur Decretum S. Officii diei 20 Decembris 1899, quo ordinatio Decreti diei 3 Maii 1899 (resp. d. 24 Novembris 1897) ad Superiores Generales Ordinum Religiosorum extensa est ita:

(h) *B.me Pater,*—Superior Generalis Ordinis N. N. ad pedes S. V. provolutus humiliter postulat ut declarare dignetur:

Utrum resolutio S. R. et U. Inquisitionis diei 3 Maii 1899 a S. V. approbata die 5 eiusdem mensis et anni, qua declaratum fuit omnes facultates speciales a Sancta Sede habitualiter concessas Episcopis aliorumque locorum Ordinariis, licet ad praefinitum tempus, ob eorum mortem vel a munere cessationem ad successores transire, se extendat ad omnes Superiores. Et Deus, etc.

Feria IV, die 20 Decembris 1899.

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis coram E.mis ac R.mis DD. Cardinalibus in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitoribus Generalibus habita, proposito supradicto dubio, praehabitoque RR. DD. Consultorum voto, iidem EE. ac RR. Patres respondendum decreverunt:

Supplicandum Santissimo pro extensione decreti fer. IV. Maii 1899, ad Superiores Generales Ordinum Religiosorum.

Sequenti vero fer. VI, die 22 eiusdem mensis et anni, per facultates E.mo ac R.mo D.no Cardinali S. Officii Secretario tributas, SS.mus D. N. Leo Div. Prov. PP. XIII resolutionem E.morum ac R.morum Patrum approbavit, ac extensionem praedictam benigne concessit.[17]

J. Card. Mancini, *S. R. et U. Inquisit. Notarius.*

[16] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxxii, pag. 60.

[17] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xxxii, p. 503.

Ex hactenus digestis alios quoque effectus iuridicos prono alveo profluere nemo est qui non videat. Id unum heic memorasse iuvabit quippe quod nuper ex eodem fonte authentico manavit—ecce:

(i) *B.me. Pater*,—In casibus urgentioribus . . . (Decr. S. Officii d. 20 Junii 1886[18]) dari potest absolutio a reservatis S. Sedi, sub poena tamen reincidentiae nisi absolutus infra mensem ad Sanctam Sedem recurrat, eius mandata suscepturus.

Ubi tamen Episcopi facultatem habent delegatam absolvendi a praedictis reservatis, qualis solet ipsis concedi per quinquennale folium S. Congr. de Propaganda Fide (F. X.)[19] sub n. 10, dubitatur de necessitate recursus immediati ad S. Sedem.

Quaerit igitur Episcopus N. N. ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae humiliter provolutus:

I.—Utrum sufficiat, in casu absolutionis ut supra concessae, recursus ad Episcopum facultate absolvendi instructum; et quatenus affirmative:

II.—Utrum sufficiat etiam in casu eodem recursus ad *Vicarium generalem Episcopi* TAMQUAM AD ORDINARIUM FACULTATUM EPISCOPALIUM ABSOLVENDI DE IURE PARTICIPEM.

III.—Utrum generatim sufficiat recursus ad quemlibet sacerdotem habitualiter subdelegatum ab Ordinario ad absolvendum ab his papalibus reservatis, a quibus poenitens fuerit accidentaliter, ut supra, vi decreti S. Officii 1886, absolutus? Et Deus, etc.

Feria IV, die 19 Decembris 1900.

In Congregatione Generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis ab E.mis ac R.mis DD. Cardinalibus Generalibus Inquisitoribus habita, propositis suprascriptis dubiis, praehabitoque RR. Consultorum voto, iidem E.mi ac R.mi Patres respondendum mandarunt:

Ad I et *II Affirmative, facto verbo cum Sanctissimo.*

Ad III Negative.

Feria VI vero, die 19[20] eiusdem mensis et anni, in solita audientia SS.mi D. N. Leonis Div. Prov. PP. XIII a R. P. D. Assessore S. Officii habita, SS.mus D. N. resolutionem E.morum ac R.morum Patrum ratam habuit et confirmavit.

J. CARD. MANCINI, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius.*

[18] Cf. *Acta S. Sedis*, tom. xiv, p. 46.

[19] Episcopis Americanis in F. I. num. 16.

[20] Sic.

Itaque ex ipsis S. Officii recens decisis elucet thesis proposita : IN FACULTATIBUS APOSTOLICIS HABITUALIBUS QUOD VALET EPISCOPUS VALET VICARIUS GENERALIS, NISI IUS DIVINUM OBSTET.

Applicando tandem novo hoc iuris adagio in commodum Ordinariorum aliorumque quorum interest, nonnullas quasi regulas heic adiiciendas curavimus ex supra deductis depromptas, collato iure communi.

1. Facultas in casu non intelligitur Indultum quoddam *personale* v. c. altaris privilegiati, sed intelligitur *qualibet potestas* pro foro externo vel interno vel utroque vel pro gratiis concedendis, verbo pro bono regimine ecclesiae tributa.

2. Facultas *Apostolica* intelligitur concessa *a S. Sede* sive immediate a Pontifice Maximo, sive mediate per Congregationem vel Secretariam vel quodlibet aliud medium : hinc non intelligitur facultas accepta a quodam Superiori Ordinis Religiosi.

3. Facultas Apostolica *specialis* dicitur non quae est insolita vel rarissime datur, sed quae pro hoc vel illa Ecclesia, pro hoc vel illo Vicariatu etc. specialiter est concessa. Nam *generales facultates* sunt quae omnibus locorum Ordinariis sunt tributae, uti v. c. facultas die 20 Februarii 1888 per S. Officium concessa omnibus Ordinariis locorum, dispensandi sc. in impedimentis matrimonium dirimentibus in gravissimo mortis periculo : et *has generales* participant quicumque nomine Ordinarii veniunt ut supra.

4. Additur : *habitualiter concessae*, quia *non* intelliguntur heic facultates, si quae forte pro uno alterove determinato casu fuerint concessae Episcopo (resp. Administratori vel Vicario Apostolico vel Praefecto Apostolico) : caeterae omnes heic intelliguntur.

5. *Vicarius in spiritualibus generalis* non intelligitur tantum *Episcopi*, sed et Vicarius in spiritualibus *Administratoris* sive *Praefecti Apostolici*, item *Praelati* (sive *Praefecti*) *habentis iurisdictionem cum territorio separato.*

6. Vicarius generalis cum non iam Episcopi (resp. Administratoris Apostolici, cet.) sed ipsius Papae delegatus existat, scilicet in facultatibus Apostolicis supra descriptis, non iam poterit ab Episcopo subdelegari sed immo poterit subdelegare.

7. In subdelegando autem Vicarius Generalis, sicut ipse Epis-

copus (resp. Administrator Apostolicus, cet.), adamussim servet formam Rescripti, quippe quo coarctatur subinde ius subdelegandi.

8. Hodie omnes facultates in Formulis, sive alias, Episcopis concessae "subdelegandi suis Vicariis Generalibus quampiam facultatem vel facultates" censendae sunt superfluae. Signanter v. c. in facultate *Form* D, *art.* 8, cui consonat facultas *Form.* E, *art. final.* ita: "subdelegandi praesentes facultates (*suis Vicariis generalibus quoties ultra diem a propria residentia abesse debeat atque*) duobus vel tribus presbyteris sibi benevisis in locis remotioribus propriae Diocesis, pro aliquo tamen numero casuum urgentiorum in quibus recursus ad ipsum haberi non possit;" verba illa, quae parenthesi inclusimus, plane superflua hodie existunt, quia Vicarius generalis, sicut ipse Episcopus, est delegatus Papae; unde Vicario generali adeo non opus est delegatione vel communicatione Episcopi, ut ipse potius duos vel tres illos presbyteros valeat subdelegare, nisi Episcopus iam subdelegaverit.

9. Consequitur ulterius Vicarium generalem facultatis *communicandi* esse *de iure* participem. Cogita *Form.* I, *art.* 28: "Praedictas facultates communicandi, non tamen illas, quae requirunt Ordinem Episcopalem, vel non sine Sacrorum Oleorum usu exercentur, sacerdotibus idoneis qui in eorum dioecesibus laborabunt, et praesertim tempore sui obitus, ut sede vacante sit qui possit supplere, donec Sedes Apostolica certior facta, quod quamprimum fieri debebit per delegatos, vel per unum ex iis, alio modo provideat; quibus delegatis auctoritate Apostolica facultas conceditur, sede vacante et in casu necessitatis, consecrandi calices, patenas et altaria portatilia Sacris Oleis, ab Episcopo tamen benedictis."

10. Ad quae quidem probe notetur aliud esse *communicare*, aliud *subdelegare* facultatem. *Communicatione* nimirum transfertur facultatis Apostolicae *plena participatio* qua quis fiat ipse quoque *delegatus Papae* ad tempus quod currit facultas, non obstante morte vel a munere cessatione illius qui facultatem communicavit. *Subdelegatione* vero transfertur facultatis Apostolicae *minus plena participatio*, qua quis fiat *delegati Papae subdelegatus* ad tempus quod currit subdelegatio: quae cessat v. c. per mortem vel aliam a munere cessationem delegantis.

11. *Communicatio* fieri nequit nisi quatenus S. Sedis expresse concesserit; *subdelegatio* autem fieri potest nisi quatenus S. Sedes

expresse prohibuerit, sive implicite—scilicet coarctando, limitando —sive explicite—scilicet diserte prohibendo.

ANT. C. M. SCHAEPMAN, Iur. Can. Dr.
Zevenaar,
Archid. Ultraiect.

THE SACRAMENT OF CONFIRMATION IN THE OLD COLONIES.

THE administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation in the old colonial times of North America might be considered at first sight as only a question about the presence or absence of a Bishop in the colonies. It was in this light that the London Vicar-Apostolic, Dr. Challoner, regarded it; and he represented this view constantly as a reason for settling a Bishop there. In all his correspondence with Rome, the mention of Confirmation is ever coupled with an urgent plea to have an episcopal appointment made. As an interest to be weighed on its own merits, without attaching to it as a matter of necessity the proposal of a bishopric, it does not occur in his papers; except when that issue is forced on him from Rome, that Confirmation might be administered without a Bishop, then he begs to be excused from coöperating.

It is only when the Americans themselves speak for the first time to the Pope, that they take occasion on the spot to treat of Confirmation on its own merits. Declaring that they are now debarred from further intercourse with England, they approach the question in a manner different from that of England. It seems to them worthy of being met in either of the alternative ways, whether by the administration of a Bishop or by that of a priest duly empowered.

Now, as this view of the question, which was certainly a most sane and respectful way of treating so holy and momentous a Sacrament, could have been taken with just as much propriety forty years before, and without waiting for the preliminary cost of a great revolution to purchase it, the query naturally arises, why was such a view not taken before? And if, in the correspondence of the Vicar-Apostolic, so much was made of an episcopal settlement as a means to provide for the administration of this Sacra-

ment, why was so little made of the end on its own account? The sincerity of Dr. Challoner forbids our entertaining the notion that he took his stand on this platform merely as the expedient of an opportunist. If he did not, then the old policy held good, that the end is of more consequence than the means; and get it with a Bishop if you can, but get it anyhow.

We propose to glance at the question from three sides: first from that of Rome and the General of the Jesuits, these latter being then the sole body of missionaries on the mainland of English America; secondly, from that of the Vicar-Apostolic in London, who had jurisdiction over both the mainland and the West Indian islands, as far as these became English; thirdly, from that of Dr. John Carroll, who did actually administer Confirmation, first as a priest, and then as a Bishop.

I.

At the end of 1742, or the beginning of 1743, the Jesuit Provincial of England, Father Charles Shireburn, desired the Rector of Liège, Father Charles Rousse or Roels, to consult the General in his name on a matter now proposed by the Vicar-Apostolic of London, Dr. Benjamin Petre. The date was just a year or so after the appointment of Dr. Challoner as coadjutor to Dr. Petre. The question was about making the Jesuit Superior in Maryland a Vicar-General of his Lordship. But the proposal was not sufficiently distinct for the General and he replied in these terms:

"The subject, which your Reverence has propounded to me at your Father Provincial's request, calls for explanation. If his lordship, the Vicar-Apostolic of Maryland and Pennsylvania, wishes to substitute for himself our Priest, the Superior of those Missions, on such a basis of vicarious administration, as to delegate all his ordinary and habitual jurisdiction for every variety of cause that may concern the office, whether matter of grace or matter of litigation, such a vicarious office cannot be accepted by a priest of ours, on account of our special vow. Still a petition may be presented by his lordship to his Holiness for a dispensation, which it will not be hard to obtain in the circumstances. If, however, he wishes to communicate his power only for one or other transient act, although the matter be contentious; or, if he

wishes to delegate even in its entirety all his jurisdiction in matters of grace alone, as dispensations, absolutions, etc., in that case there is no need of further dispensation, and our Priest can accept of it.[1] Finally, the whole matter can be adjusted also in this way, without having recourse to the Apostolic See; namely, that his lordship delegate all his jurisdiction to some one else not of the Society, but at the same time impose upon him the obligation of doing nothing without the counsel and approbation of our Priest. Your Reverence may communicate the above to your Father Provincial."[2]

In the last clause of this paragraph one may recognize the policy which had been followed by Rome in the case of the English Archpriest, Blackwell, 1598–1601; and, in the tenor of this letter, one may see the principle of that policy. But in America at this date, 1743, there were no men outside of the Society eligible for a post like that of Archpriest.

The permission granted by the General to take off the Bishop's hands, without more ado, the administration of matters of grace, "dispensations, indulgences, etc.," clearly left the Jesuit free to accept and exercise such an administration as that of Confirmation, if offered. That did not belong to the contentious forum, or litigation. Nay, the General showed such consideration for distant Maryland that he left it at his lordship's discretion to obtain a dispensation from Rome for Father Thomas Poulton or Father Richard Molyneux, the Maryland Superior of the time, and so have him qualified to become a full Vicar-General.

This was in 1743. A hundred years later, Father John Anthony Grassi, who had been Superior of the Maryland Mission, wrote a memoir for the General Father Roothaan, and made this statement:

"In view of the very great distance from any bishop, the Holy See had granted extraordinary faculties to Jesuit missionaries, and at certain times even that of administering the Sacrament of Con-

[1] Si autem vult pro uno alterove solum actu transeunte, etiam in causis contentiosis, suam potestatem Ipsi tribuere, vel solas gratiosas, uti sunt: dispensationes, absolutiones, etc., licet universim, Ipsi delegare, id absque alia dispensatione noster Sacerdos admittere potest.

[2] Gen. Epist. Anglia: 1743, Mart. 9; Leodium, P. Carolo Roels.

firmation to the faithful living in those far-off regions." Here he adds a foot-note: "I saw in the sacristy of the residence of St. Thomas', near Portobacco, in the year 1812, letters patent for such a faculty."[3]

Considering the very precise terms of this statement, we cannot gratuitously suppose that he was mistaking one thing for another —the faculties, for instance, of the Prefect Apostolic, Dr. Carroll, for those imparted to the old Jesuit missionaries. The objective error would have been somewhat too gross in a man who, a contemporary of John Carroll, was also a successor of his as Superior of those missionary stations. Besides, St. Thomas' was not the place for any papers belonging to Father Carroll, who had never lived there. But late Superiors of Maryland, Father George Hunter and Father Richard Molyneux, not to mention others, had lived permanently at St. Thomas', as the headquarters of the mission. And so we may accept the testimony of Father Grassi, who as a responsible Superior had moved to and fro between Georgetown and St. Thomas', that there had been authentic faculties to confirm bestowed upon some Jesuit or Jesuits during the missionary times of Maryland. These times had been prior to the revolution and prior to the suppression of the Society. For, with the breaking out of the revolutionary war, the old order of things came to an end; and, with the suppression, the Jesuits themselves in Maryland had reached their term.

II.

As to the sense of Rome and the Holy See on the subject of delegating missionary priests to administer Confirmation, there was nothing very extraordinary in such an arrangement. Only eight years after the date of the letter quoted above, from the General Father Retz to the Rector of Liège, Pope Benedict XIV

[3] Attesa la somma lontananza de qualunque Vescovo la S. Sede aveva accordato straordinarie facoltà a Missionarii Gesuiti, e in certi tempi anche quella di amministrare il Sacramento della Confirmazione a' fedeli abitanti in quelle dissite regioni.

(*a*) Nella Sacristia della Residenza di S. Tommaso presso Portobacco vidi nel 1812 una patente per tale facoltà.

Grassi, Jo. Ant.: Memorie sulla Comp. di Gesú, ristabilita negli Stati Uniti, ecc.; pag. 6.

conveyed to the next General, Father Visconti, a very comprehensive indult regarding that Sacrament. To the Superiors of all the missions belonging to the Province of Quito, in the vast regions of the Amazon, the Pope gave a general power of confirming, with Chrism that might be had from any orthodox bishop, and that might be old, if newer could not be had. During the lifetime of the bishop, in whose diocese the mission happened to be, permission was to be obtained from him once for all, and he was obliged to give it gratis. In territories that were *nullius*, under no episcopal jurisdiction, but were committed directly to the Society by the Apostolic See, there was no need of reporting to anybody. The Superior so empowered could delegate one or more of his missionaries. And all the Jesuit missionaries were herewith authorized to confirm anybody in danger of death, or at the point of death, *in periculo vel articulo mortis.*[4]

To show the general course of events, with reference to this point, we may mention a circumstance or two which will refresh the memory of readers on the subject.

About 1670, the Vicar-Apostolic of Cochin-China had censured an opinion put forward in the Moral Theology of Quintana Duegna, a Jesuit, to the effect that, in the East and West Indies, and in other countries of the infidels, all regulars could administer the Sacrament of Confirmation to all the faithful, and could confer minor orders on their own subjects; and that these powers were derived from the bulls of Leo X and Adrian VI. The condemnation of this opinion by the Vicar-Apostolic brought upon him an excommunication from the local inquisitor. Clement X, when appealed to, declared in favor of the Bishop; and added that the wide proposition, which had been censured, was not sufficiently grounded on the aforesaid privileges of Leo X and Adrian VI; and, to be sustained, it must be made to rest on other special privileges.[5]

Here it is clear that no offence was taken at the idea of large

[4] Hernaez: Colleccion de Bulas, Breves y otros documentos relativos a la Iglesia de America, etc.; tom. i, pp. 441–4; Benedict XIV, 8 Sept. 1751; *Non solum.* Bruselas, 1879.

[5] Bullarium Patronatus Portugalliae Regum, etc.; tom. ii, pp. 128–9; Clemens Papa X, 11 Sept. 1671; *Coelestibus et apostolicis.* Olisipone, 1870.

powers being wielded by simple missionaries; and reasonably, as those bulls of Leo X and Adrian VI make manifest. In the first diploma of powers which Leo X granted to Franciscan missionaries departing for America, he commended their apostolic labors in the terms of a long series of his predecessors, from Nicolaus IV onwards, and renewed an imposing array of faculties already granted by those Popes. These he reissued in favor of America. To speak only of our present subject, the Friars had the power, in case of necessity, when there were no Bishops in the province, to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation to the faithful, with Chrism that was even three years old, and to confer minor orders. Renewing these powers, Leo X defines the limitation, that, as to those powers which concern the episcopal order and dignity, they could not be exercised in virtue of the present bull, except in provinces where there was no Catholic Bishop; for elsewhere pontifical functions could be performed only by Bishops.[6] On the subject of jurisdiction, the next Pope, Adrian VI, made a very sweeping and trenchant provision in his constitution called the "Omnimoda." He simply granted to the Friars Minor for Spanish America "all the apostolic authority of the Holy See, in respect of internal and external jurisdiction alike, as far as they should judge expedient" to use it, for the ministry entrusted to them.[7] The limitation arising from the jurisdiction of a Bishop in his territory was defined to suppose, that the episcopal officials could be reached within a two days' journey.[8] Here it may be observed that Maryland was a two months' voyage from the nearest bishopric, that of London. For, as to Quebec, that See might be nearer in a geographical line, but it was much farther in practical intercourse.

Paul III, rehearsing and confirming the ample grant of Adrian VI, extended the application of it to the territory of bishoprics in Spanish America, and subjected the use of it there to the consent of the Bishops.[9]

[6] Hernaez, I, pp. 377–9; Leo X, 25 Apr. 1521; *Alias felicis.*

[7] Omnimodam auctoritatem nostram in utroque foro:—Hernaez, *ibid.*, pp. 382–4; Adrian VI, 9 Maii 1522, *Exponi nobis.*

[8] Infra duarum dietarum spatium.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 390–1; Paul III, 15 Febr. 1535; *Alias felicis.*

To explain a circumstance in this Maryland question, we mention just one point more, that Julius II and Leo X had granted the formal communication of all privileges, graces and indults, as among the mendicant Orders themselves; and this relationship among them became one of juridical right as well as charity.[10]

In the Society, while the General alone could commission his subordinates to use faculties or privileges, there were always other considerations besides, which still further qualified their use. Thus we find a note in the Maryland archives to the following effect: "Some points of the grant," says the note, "must be used cautiously, when any danger should appear in [of?] displeasing Ecclesiastical Superiors."[11] We are inclined to think that it was such a consideration as this which governed the question of Confirmation in the provinces of Maryland and Pennsylvania.

However that may be, we observe that Father George Hunter, the Superior of Maryland, crossed over to England several times during Bishop Challoner's term of office. Once he passed through Canada. Half a century later, a successor of his in office, Father Grassi, saw patents for the faculty of confirming, at the place of Father Hunter's old residence.

III.

There was an offset to the picture which we have just given, of what Rome and the Popes thought and did with reference to the Sacrament of Confirmation. We cannot show off this side better than by referring to an episode, heretofore unknown, in the career of the first Lord Baltimore. During the years 1628–1631, when George Calvert, the recent convert, was moving about between England, Newfoundland, and the Chesapeake, he was also immersed, while at home, in Catholic controversy, and that not with Protestants, but with the members of the household. He and eleven other Catholic peers emphatically dissented from the proposal that Dr. Smith, the Bishop of Chalcedon, should be recognized as exercising the powers of an Ordinary. Answering

[10] *Ibid.*, pp 376–7; Julius II, 1 Junii 1509; *Alias ad supplicationem;* Leo X, 10 Dec. 1519; *Dudum per nos.*

[11] L. i, p. 9.

his pastoral announcement, they declared to him that his claim, if admitted by them, would involve them and their families in the penalties of *premunire;* and he had no right to come and make such a demand on them. Lord Baltimore's correspondence with Lord Petre, supported by other circumstances, shows us that he was a leading spirit, if not the leader, in the agitation, which he kept strictly on the ground of a layman's protest. Accordingly, in the next protestation, to which some twenty-five lords assent in different degrees, with three hundred more of the Catholic aristocracy, he touches and sets aside the purely ecclesiastical issues at stake. "Omitting," he says, "other points, which do not concern the present case, and which are held as incontrovertible among Catholics; for instance, that episcopal authority, confirmation, and the like, are necessary in the Church of God; omitting, too, the dispute which is in progress as between the regulars and the seculars, wherein we do not meddle." [12]

For this figure of preterition, whereby they left the ecclesiastical merits of the question on one side, Baltimore and the other Catholic lords had good reason; not only in the propriety of the case, as they were laymen, but also in the nature of the theology which had been imported into the controversy. The importations had been chiefly from France, whence Gallicans, like Francis Hallier, had not only lent their opinions but had lent themselves, plunging headlong with big books into the affray; and this, they said, the French Church had a right to do, with regard to England, by an original and native claim of jurisdiction. Hence there was no want of variety in the tenets and pamphlets and books of the time. We quote some of the dogmas which Baltimore and the other peers were reading at that date:—

As to the Sacrament of Confirmation: This is a means necessary to salvation, and has so been defined by the Church. Sufficient grace can be had without this Sacrament; but not efficacious grace, unto the confession of the faith before a tyrant. It is in the highest degree doubtful whether the power of administering Confirmation can be conferred upon a simple priest. The Sovereign Pontiff would commit a sin if he entrusted the power

[12] Documents of 1628: Aug. 8, 1631; again, Aug. 1631; all of Calvert's or of the Peers with Calvert. Copies, with other documents in Archives, S.J.

of administering Confirmation to any one else but a bishop, just as he would commit a sin if he permitted Consecration in dubious matter, and so ran the risk of sacrilege.

As to regulars, or members of religious orders, there was no end of variations to the Gallican theme. It was held that religious as religious, including those whom the Sovereign Pontiff has commissioned to go and preach the Gospel, belong to the passive order in the Church of those who must listen and learn, and are to be reckoned among the laity. It is a violation of the divine law, that the people of any bishopric should be provided for by the Sovereign Pontiff through none but regulars. The obligation which binds a curate is that of a good shepherd; the obligation which binds a religious is that of the mercenary, described in the Gospel of St. John, chapter 10. Religious Orders, even those which have been instituted by Papal privilege to work for the salvation of souls, go beyond the limits of their vocation when they busy themselves with the conversion of souls or the preaching of the word of God.[13]

All that has been generally known of the part which Lord Baltimore took in this controversy seems to be that notice which Panzani left of him in the Memorial drawn up for Rome. The little paragraph is a good specimen of the whole Memorial, as the propositions given above are a specimen of the merits of the question. He says: "George Calvert, Baron of Baltimore, signed [the Protestation] at the instance of Toby Matthews, and of Father Knott, a Jesuit; but he died a few days later; and by some it was ascribed to the judgment of God."[14]

We shall meet now with an American layman and divers associates of his, treating a similar question on parallel lines with the

[13] We pick these from a very extensive syllabus of 16 pp. fol., under the caption: Propositiones quaedam collectae ex libris Rmi. Chalcedonensis aliorumque auctorum, qui ipsius causam defenderunt. The authors, books, and exact places of the quotations are indicated: *Angl. Histor.*, vol. iii, ff. 469—477, vo; in Arch. S.J.

[14] *Giorgio Caluert* barone di Baltimore sotoscrisse a persuasione [f. 37] di Tobia Mattei, e del P. Knot Gesuita, ma morì pochi giorni doppo; e da alcuni fu attribuito a giuditio d'Idio.—Barberini, lvi, 136, ff. 36vo, 37. For Penzani, who saw Jesuits everywhere, Sir Toby Matthews was a Jesuit in short cassock. A sketch of the Memorial, with this passage about Calvert, may be seen in Brady, W. Maziere: Episcopal Succession, etc., vol. iii, pp. 83–103; Rome, 1877.

first Lord Baltimore. But let us first look at the correspondence of Dr. Challoner, Vicar-Apostolic of London. It is pretty well known; so we need only select the relative phrases or short passages. And, even among them, it would be quite monotonous to reproduce all here.

IV.

On September 14, 1756, Dr. Challoner wrote to Dr. Stonor, the clergy agent at Rome, that "some have wished, considering the number of the faithful, especially in those two provinces [of Maryland and Pennsylvania], destitute of the Sacrament of Confirmation, and lying at so great a distance from us, that a Bishop or Vicar-Apostolic should be appointed for them. But how far this may be judged practicable by our Superiors, I know not; especially as it may not be relished by those [the Jesuit missionaries] who have engrossed that best part of the mission to themselves; and who may, not without show of probability, object that a novelty of this kind might give offence to the governing part there; who have been a little hard upon them of late years." After describing the desolate condition of some British colonies on the mainland, he says: "As to the [West Indian] islands, the state of religion is much worse than on the continent;" in the general relaxation there, "neither priests nor people are half so regular as the Marylandians and Pennsylvanians are." All priests in those parts apply to the London Vicar-Apostolic for faculties; "which is true of the padri also [the Jesuit missionaries] in Mariland and Pensilvania; at least from the time of the Breve of Innoc. XII in 1696; only that they used rather to ask for approbation; but now also for faculties."

On August 2, 1763, in a report ordered by the Propaganda, he says of the Maryland and Pennsylvania missionaries, that "the Jesuits, having faculties from us, acquit themselves with great credit of their duties in those Missions."[15] There are about eighteen missionaries, and they take in New Jersey and Virginia besides. Dr. Challoner then goes on to plead for Confirmation on behalf of the 23,000 Catholics there; and he proposes that the Bishop of Quebec be charged with that duty.

[15] Et Jesuitae, acceptis a nobis facultatibus, illic valde laudabiliter Missiones exercent.

Half a year later, he returns to the same thesis with his agent, on March 15, 1764.

In this year, 1764, the Roman agent presented to the Sacred Congregation a report in eleven sections, clearly derived from Dr. Challoner's previous correspondence on the English colonies of America. He surveys all from Canada down to the Antilles. As to the sixteen Jesuit Priests in Maryland and Pennsylvania, he says: "These religious conduct themselves with great zeal and edification."[16] The story of the Islands is just the reverse. In the name of Dr. Challoner, he pleads for the appointment of a Vicar-Apostolic, preferably in Philadelphia. And the reasons alleged are these: First, the great distance does not permit Dr. Challoner to make a personal visitation in America; therefore, secondly, he cannot have the requisite information for the correction of abuses; thirdly, he cannot administer the Sacrament of Confirmation to the faithful there, who remain entirely destitute of that spiritual succor;[17] fourthly, he cannot provide ecclesiastical ministers, partly because of the said distance, partly because he has not the pecuniary means.

In the next year, 1765, February 15th, Dr. Challoner is much encouraged at the prospect of an appointment for America; but, at the same time, he is discouraged on contemplating those Jesuits over there, how they would receive and provide for what he calls "one of ours," if sent to be quartered on them. He says to his agent: "What you add of settling 2 or 3 VV. AA. in that part of the world is an object that certainly deserves the attention of our friends. But I foresee the execution of it will meet with very great difficulties, especially in Mariland and Pensilvania, where the padri have had so long possession and will hardly endure a pt. [priest]; much less a B. [Bishop] of any other institute; nor indeed do I know of any one of ours that would be fond of going amongst them, nor of any one that would be proper for that station who could be spared by us in our present circumstances."

On May 31 of the same year, he laments the destitution of the

[16] Questi Religiosi si comportano con gran zelo e regolarita di costumi.

[17] Non puol amministrare il Sagramento della Confermazione a quelli fedeli, che rimangono totalmente privi di questo spirituale aiuto.

Catholics with regard to Confirmation, and enters a protest; it is, he says, "what I am sure our friends [in Rome] will never suffer."

V.

At this point the Catholic laymen of Maryland interpose. They do so under the leadership of one who was quite worthy of being ranked with George Calvert, the founder of the Baltimore dynasty, and with two others of his own name, Charles Carroll, his father, the attorney-general of Maryland, and Charles Carroll, his son, the signer of the Declaration of Independence. The line they follow is just the same as that pursued by Calvert, one hundred and thirty-five years before. Having received word that an Apostolic Vicar was in prospect, they protest against the project, but without even touching a strictly ecclesiastical issue. All their motives are such as suit laymen, who know the temper of the times, and who are positive that it is not the time for a Bishop. One letter is that of C. Carroll, Ign. Diggs, Hen. Darnall, P. Manner and 256 other Roman Catholics of the Province of Maryland; and is addressed to the Jesuit Provincial, Mr. Dennett, as "head of the Gentln. we have for our teachers"; desiring him "to transmit copys hereof to all whom it may concern." At the same time, Charles Carroll sends a personal letter, July 16, 1765, to the Vicar-Apostolic, saying: "Although I have subscribed with others to that letter, other considerations have induced me singly to address myself to yr Ldship on the subject." And then lower down: "Some may suggest yt this my letter to yr Ldship as well as the R. Caths. letter to Mr. Dennet has been wrote at the instigation of the Jesuits. For myself my Lord I most sincerely profess yt uninfluenced by 'em I write this, and sign'd ye other letter, wch. contains not only my own but I am very well convinced ye true sentiments of every Rom. Cathck. in Maryland." Now the stand which these Catholics take may be given in one phrase of the joint letter. They say: "We think it our duty to God, ourselves, and posterity to represent our objections against such a measure, as wt [what] would give our adversaries, bent on our ruin, a stronger handle yn [than] anything they have

hitherto been able to lay hold on, and consequently terminate in the utter extirpation of our holy religion." [18]

These letters met with the same treatment as Panzani and those he represented had dealt out to the protest of Baltimore and the other lords. For, in the next letter which we have, dated September 12, 1766, fourteen months after the protest of the Maryland laymen, Dr. Challoner says to his Roman agent, Dr. Stonor: "I believe I never told you how much those gentlemen [the Jesuits] were alarmed upon hearing the first rumour of a Bp. [Bishop] being designed for North America; and what opposition and subscriptions they procured from the laity there; which they would have had me to send to Hilton [Rome], but I desired to be excused. By which I plainly see it will be no easy matter to place a B. [Bishop] there, although there be so many thousands there that live and die without confirmation. The case of the Islands is still worse, as they are very indifferently served with miss—s [missioners]," etc.[19]

Now Rome came to the rescue, and proposed that Priests should be empowered to administer Confirmation. The Bishop expresses his alarm, and declines to coöperate. On the 4th of June, 1771, he writes to his agent: "The Memorial regarding the affairs of America, which you have sent me by order of the Sacred Congregation, has appeared to me truly worthy of the distinguished prudence of the Eminent Cardinals; and I find that it resolves with perfect precision the doubts and scruples which I had proposed." Speaking of the islands, he finds only one there, Father Benjamin the Capucin, on whom he can rely, and so he proposes to renew that Priest's faculties as Vicar-General for the newly acquired islands. He proceeds: "As to what is proposed in the Memorial about giving to the said Father Benjamin or to some other Missionary an extraordinary faculty to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, I see great difficulties in the way. The measure is without example in those parts; and there is reason to fear, that such a novelty could give some

[18] From contemporary copies in Arch. S. J.

[19] Much of the Challoner correspondence thus far cited may be seen published in the American Catholic Historical Researches, XIII, pp. 35–40; XII, pp. 44–5. The documents themselves are in the Westminster and Propaganda Archives.

kind of scandal, as well to Catholics as to the heretics themselves. Moreover, as the Missionaries in those parts are so little united among themselves, I should be afraid of giving such an extraordinary commission to any one of them. Above all, I should not wish to give it to any one of those Missionaries who are now in the islands belonging to Great Britain before the last war." [20]

The reasons, then, which the venerable Bishop alleges against passing on the faculties for Confirmation to a Priest, are these: First, it is a thing unexampled that a Priest should ever give such a Sacrament there. This reason, however, might lead the Sacred Congregation to quote his own papers, that it was a thing unexampled for a Bishop ever to give such a Sacrament there. Secondly, that such a novelty might cause some kind of scandal both to Catholics and to Protestants. The answer might come, that, where the novelty was to be tolerated, he was the best judge, since he had been arguing for it during the last twenty years; and as to the scandal of heretics in giving the Sacraments to Catholics, that seemed to be a novelty in theology. Thirdly, that the missionaries were equal, and preference would cause trouble. This reason would stop all further appointment of Bishops in the Catholic Church. Fourthly, no one of the missionaries found in the older British islands was worthy of confidence. The answer was obvious: Give the faculties at least to your Father Benjamin the Capucin.

However, if no Priest is to confirm in America, we may hope now at least to hear no more complaints about the Sacrament being denied to the Americans through the fault of other people. To our surprise, he continues, in the same letter: "As for what concerns the mainland, Catholics are in great numbers in the two Provinces of Maryland and Pensilvania; and there are some others scattered in the neighboring colonies of Virginia and New Jersey, all under the care of the Jesuit Fathers, who receive their faculties from me. According to their relations, these Missions are in a very flourishing state. For the rest, it is a lamentable thing, that so great a multitude have to live and die always deprived of the Sacrament of Confirmation. These Fathers

[20] Estratto di una Lettera del Vicario Apostolico di Londra al suo Agente in Roma in data delli 4 Giugno 1771; ad init.

show an indescribable repugnance to the settlement of a Bishop among them, under the pretext that it could excite a violent persecution on the part of the secular government." Then he goes on to argue that, at least, the Bishop of Quebec might be invited to come down to Maryland.[21]

Whatever may be the case of the Fathers, it is quite clear that some one else has "an indescribable repugnance" to handing on the powers for Confirmation, offered by Rome. Here, in Maryland, the missionaries are not disunited, as in the islands. They have a superior who is recognized by the Bishop himself. They are all excellent, according to the Bishop's repeated testimony. The people are not dissolving in luxury like the populations of the islands, but have been in the crucible of a searching persecution.

In the course of a year or so, orders were expedited from Rome, requiring Mgr. Briand, the Bishop of Quebec, to go and administer Confirmation in Bishop Challoner's district, Maryland and Pennsylvania. As Quebec, for all practical purposes, was farther from that district than London, and, as something was known there about the truth of what had been stigmatized to the Sacred Congregation as a "pretext," Mgr. Briand consulted the Jesuits of Canada; and they consulted the Jesuits of Maryland. And the consequence was, that Mgr. Briand went not.

One word from Father Farmer's letter on the subject will show just where Bishop Challoner left the matter: "I would not have it understood," he writes, "as if we ourselves do not ardently desire that Confirmation could be administered to the faithful born here, but that we see plainly with our eyes in the state of mind among the Americans, that such a measure could not be taken with safety by a person invested with the character of a dignitary."[22]

Thus, in the state of the public mind, only one way was practical and would have been effectual; and that was to invest a

[21] É cosa per altro da compiangere, che una moltitudine cosi grande abbia de vivere e morire priva sempre dal Sagramento della Cresima. Quei Padri mostrano una ripugnanza indicibile allo stabilimento di un Vescovo tra loro, sotto pretesto ecc.

[22] Fr. Ferd. Farmer, Philadelphia, 22 April, 1773, to Fr. Well, Mascouchi. University Arch., Quebec.—For a part of this letter, *cf.* Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J.: Historical Records and Studies of U. S. Cath. Hist. Society, New York, Vol. I, pp. 275–6; Appendix to article on The Beginnings of the Hierarchy in U. S.

priest with the powers of confirming. That was the one way for which the Vicar-Apostolic of London had an "indescribable repugnance," to employ his own phrase. The venerable Bishop departed this life on the 12th of January, 1781, leaving things as they had been forty years before. On June 19, 1784—that is, three and a half years after Dr. Challoner's death—the jurisdiction of London over the American English colonies was abolished, as a letter of Cardinal Antonelli informed Bishop James Talbot, Vicar-Apostolic of the London district. Henceforth, if America is to be helped, it must help itself.

We shall now conclude by observing how Father John Carroll and his colleagues did supply the crying want, which had cried so long in vain.

VI.

In a trustworthy document we find it recorded that, on the return of Father John Carroll to his native country, after the suppression of the Society, Father Lewis Roels, a Belgian, was Superior of the ex-Jesuits and "Vicar-General of the Bishop of London." [23]

This was in the year 1774, after the suppression. And we must confess candidly that it is the first documentary notice which we find of the Vicar-Apostolic in London having delegated any powers whatever to any American Jesuit or ex-Jesuit. And yet the Fathers were always applauded by him; and, as the first of what we may call the Franklin-negotiation documents puts it, they were, on occasion of the suppression, "approved again and praised by the Vicar-Apostolic of London, and each stayed at his post, and continued with zeal and industry to till the vineyard of the Lord"—a vineyard which, as the same document says, they had "founded and cultivated at their own expence, as also at the cost of great and varied labors." [24]

[23] Cenni sulla Chiesa Cattolica nella Colonia di Maryland negli Stati Uniti per quello che riguarda la Compa. di Gesu, p. 46; fifty-three pages of large 4to. The document is derived with perfect accuracy from Jesuit archives, besides public sources. We take it to be Fr. Grassi's contribution, by order of the General, to M. Cretineau-Joly's Histoire de la C. de Jésus.—In the Arch. S. J., Paris, College Ste-Geneviève. —Compare a note which we have made of it in the Calvert Papers, Vol. III, Appendix A, p. 49; Fund-Publication, No. 35, Maryland Historical Society.

[24] The Propaganda document: Missio Catholica . . . secum commorentur; without date.

In the process of organization which was then started among the ex-Jesuits, and of which we see by Father Carroll's papers that he was the life and soul, we need take note, for our present purpose, of only one or two stages.

In 1783, a former Jesuit Superior of the Mission, Father John Lewis, and four representatives of all the other missionaries, petitioned the Holy Father for a mode of government, practically that of a Prefect-Apostolic, under a Superior whom they shall elect. And on the spot they ask that such Superior for the time being shall have power to confirm. This is a lengthy document, and many specific powers of dispensation are asked for. It is in the Jesuit archives. There is a shorter form, which is in the Propaganda.[25] It retains the passage about Confirmation; and it asks for the approbation of the actual Superior, John Lewis, who, they say, was already approved and confirmed by the Vicar-Apostolic of London, and who, therefore, we may presume, followed Father Roels as Vicar-General. In both documents, the petitioners mentioned are the same,—John Lewis first, John Carroll last.[26]

Father Carroll himself was appointed Prefect-Apostolic; and writing to his friend Father Charles Plowden, he mentions that the first power communicated to him in that capacity is "a grant from the Pope to confer Confirmation." "*Cosa mirabile!*" exclaims the writer of the Paris document to which we have referred. "How extraordinary! The Sacrament of Confirmation has never yet been administered in these provinces!"[27]

They were quite content now, as Carroll told Cardinal Antonelli; and they wanted no more, till new eventualities, especially with regard to ordinations, should render the appointment of a Bishop necessary.[28] When the foundation of Georgetown Academy made this contingency a subject of actual policy, the representatives having met at White Marsh sent out a circular to their constituents, the other missionaries. They announced the decision to which they had come, of asking for a diocesan Bishop. But they

[25] And probably the original draught of this letter is that in 3 pp., fol. 9, K. of the diocesan Arch. Baltimore; in Carroll's hand.

[26] For an English version of the shorter one, see Shea's *History of the Catholic Church in U. S.*, vol. ii, pp. 309-10.

[27] Carroll to Plowden, 27 February, 1785—Cenni sulla Chiesa ecc., p. 52.

[28] Carroll to Card. Antonelli, February 27, 1785.

did not close and sign the circular, by the hand of their secretary, Father Charles Sewall, without inserting one pointed paragraph of censure upon the antecedents which had been their lot in "England and China and other Eastern countries."[29]

As to that close wedding of the proposal to give Confirmation with the fixed idea of settling a Bishop from England in Maryland, there was a note struck by Dr. Challoner in connection with it; and it was very accurately responded to by the first American Bishop. The note was that of appropriating in part the temporalities of the Jesuits for the settlement of the Bishop. For the London Vicar-Apostolic had said disapprovingly to Dr. Stonor, that the Jesuits "had engrossed that best part of the mission to themselves"; and again, "the padri there have had so long possession." He says, they would "hardly endure a Priest much less a Bishop of any other institute." Why a Priest should even be dreamt of for Missions so well manned, is not at all clear, when other places were quite destitute of good Priests. There were plenty of posts to be occupied or made, outside of the Jesuit temporalities. But there were few places like them, if there were a question of the temporal settlement of Priest or Bishop. At the same time, he expressed his regret that, in any case, he could not find "one of Ours" to send over. For, if this "one of Ours" is fit to go among those Jesuits, we cannot spare him; and, if he is unfit, we had better keep him.

Now, as to all this, express or implied in the passages quoted already, the new American Bishop spoke to Cardinal Antonelli about new-comers of the time, whom he stigmatized in private as "adventurers;" and he said they had their eyes on the best places and wanted to get them; but he represented to his Eminence that the ex-Jesuits were beloved by their flocks, and could not be removed to accommodate others.[30] At another time, he asked with fine irony: "Was it a crime to leave the harvest of *other* countries free to the workmen who were disposed to labor in it?"[31]

[29] November 24, 1786. Circular on a Diocesan Bishop; copy addressed to the Rev. Gentlemen of the Southern District.

[30] September 27, 1790, Carroll to Card. Antonelli.—Shea's transcript.

[31] Carroll's MS. against Smyth.

Meanwhile, as to the temporal settlement of a Bishop, his own appointment was the answer to that deliberation. He was provided with an episcopal *mensa* from Jesuit funds or farms. So that, in Bishop Carroll's person, all the threads were nicely gathered up and knit together: Confirmation, the bishopric, and the temporalities.

But if, to finish the question of Confirmation, one asks what had become of the old patents stored up in the residence at Portobacco, we reply: In the first place, with the dissolution of the Society there was no longer any value in them. Secondly, before the dissolution, there was no use for them, as long as the Vicar-Apostolic of London was in such a frame of mind. It is true that, in the tenor of the Quito faculties, he should have had to give his consent to their use. Still such trenching on his ground would have been a pretty source of offence, especially when it does not appear that he even used their Superior's services for the ordinary functions of a Vicar-General, such as that of imparting faculties to the other missionaries. Finally, as the venerable pastor kept the faithful thus tightly in his own charge, it was none of their business. Their rule prescribed to the members of the Order that they should not use the privileges at their disposal in such a way as to give just cause of offence to Ordinaries. So they gave no cause, just or unjust. And Bishop Challoner never complained that they did.

THOMAS HUGHES, S.J.

Rome, November, 1902.

AN HEREDITARY PAPACY.

IN a series of articles on *The Development of the Papal Conclave* which recently appeared in THE DOLPHIN, the writer, T. L. L. Teeling, gave an excellent survey of the traditional methods by which the Sovereign Pontiff is elected to his high office. Nothing was said in those papers regarding a mode of designation to which public attention was called some time ago in the popular press by the rumor that the present illustrious Pontiff had actually designated his own successor in the Papal chair. Whether this report

be true or false it will at all events be interesting to discuss the question as to its real merits from a canonical point of view.

The history of Papal succession is, on the whole, synonymous with a record of Papal elections. We see from time to time variations of method. At first it is the Roman clergy and people who pronounce; later the emperors usurp a certain prevalence; then, under the influence of the great reformer Hildebrand, Nicholas II recalls discipline to a more correct ideal, and the Cardinal Bishops are endowed with an exclusive right; and finally Alexander III gives us the law which holds to-day in virtue of which a two-thirds vote of the entire College of Cardinals is necessary to enthrone the successor of St. Peter. But amid all these changes the method of election stands out as the one historical, ordinary, legal mode of providing for Papal succession. And there can be no question that it is also the method which commends itself as the best possible in a society where human motives and human action must necessarily have a part even in the highest and holiest affairs.

However, it is quite clear that the present way of electing by vote of the Cardinals is not demanded by any immutable law, or by the divine constitution of the Church. Indeed, at one time the Cardinals exercised a very minor part in this important act. They owe their present prerogative entirely to positive, human legislation. Hence ordinances emanating from proper authority might reduce or modify this prerogative either by altering the character of the electoral body, that is by restricting, for example, the right of suffrage to the Cardinal Bishops, as was done in the time of Nicholas II; or by enlarging the conclave so as to comprise a certain number of Archbishops or Bishops. There is no difficulty in admitting the possibility of such changes. But when we go farther and seek to learn whether law, human enactments, could do away entirely with the process of election, and substitute for it the choice of a successor by the reigning Pontiff, according to his own judgment, the answer is not so apparent at all. Certainly, if the intelligence were authoritatively communicated from Rome that the present Sovereign Pontiff had named a certain Cardinal to succeed him in the government of the Church, the novelty of the act would no doubt create some astonishment throughout the

Catholic world, and many would ask in surprise: "Has the Pope really the power to name his own successor, and can he render a Conclave both unnecessary and impossible?"

The question may be a new one to the lay world, but it has long been, as was stated above, a matter of discussion among canonists and theologians; and the great majority of writers have agreed that it must be answered in the negative; that the Pope does not enjoy the prerogative of naming effectually his own successor, and that the power of designating a Pope rests essentially with the elective body in the Church. They allow that he may recommend the appointment of a certain candidate, but beyond recommendation and advice and exhortation, his activity may not pass.

It was natural that this should be the trend of opinion. Gratian,[1] inspired by explicit prohibitions of episcopal designation which he found in ancient texts, had early given a certain authority to the teaching which has been maintained in the schools down to the present day. He did not doubt the choice and appointment of Clement by Peter; he even admitted that it might serve as precedent, if a Pontiff were equally discerning in his selection of a successor; but he believed that the practice, if it were generally adopted, would result in great evils, fostering favoritism by which unworthy bishops might be installed; and consequently he held and taught that this practice had been declared altogether unlawful: "hoc autem penitus prohibetur." Gratian's dictum, and the text on which it was founded, reappear frequently in the writings of other authors. The decree of Pope Hilary, in c. 5, is cited by every writer of repute in Canon Law; the idea of a *jus hereditarium*, discussed in c. 6, 7, is repudiated, and canonists of subsequent times, following Gratian, generally assume it as a demonstrated conclusion that the Pope does not enjoy the right of designating his successor. There are, it is true, some dissentient authorities. Among these is to be mentioned the great Suarez,[2] who, while maintaining that the Pope did not ordinarily possess the right to designate a successor, defended such designation as legitimate in case of necessity.

[1] C. 8, q. 1.

[2] *De Fide*, Disp. 10.

Nor do we, on examining the more recent authorities in Canon Law, find that the controversy has entirely ceased. Among the latest publications which touch this matter we have several works by eminent Roman professors. Sebastianelli,[3] of the Apollinare, contents himself with briefly affirming his adhesion to the negative opinion, which he calls the "communior doctrina canonistarum et theologorum," assuming that the matter is settled by decrees of Popes Hilary and Pius IV. He is incredulous as to the appointment of Clement by Peter. Cavagnis,[4] of the same University, appeals to the Papal pronouncements mentioned by Sebastianelli, but also invokes certain arguments drawn from reason. The hereditary papacy, he says, is contrary to the constitution of the Church; and, besides, it would attribute activity and jurisdiction to the Pope at a time when death had stripped him of all authority. Lombardi[5] is even more outspoken. The affirmative opinion is, according to him, antiquated He does not think that any argument can undo the force of the decrees of Hilary and Pius IV; to him the idea of an hereditary Papacy is utterly repugnant to reason, whilst that of a dead Pope exercising jurisdiction appears to him too absurd to require refutation. No Pope, he triumphantly says, ever exercised this right, although more than one was so situated that personal designation of a successor would have relieved him of great anxiety, and saved the Church from cruel embarrassments. Boniface II, momentarily deluded on this point, soon saw his error, and revoked his rash act. The assumption that St. Peter named Clement is answered by Lombardi with the assertion that there is no reliable authority for the statement, which is based upon a text from Pseudo-Isidore; moreover, he thinks that the example of St. Peter, an Apostle, with unusual enlightenment and extraordinary privileges, can hardly serve as a precedent for his successors.

The point to be noted in the above-mentioned works is that they all without hesitation and unequivocally deny the effectual right of a Pope to designate his successor in the sovereign office of ruler of the Universal Church. They all convey the idea of

[3] *De Personis*, p. 83.

[4] *Jus Publicum*, vol. i, pag. 461.

[5] *Institutiones*, vol. i, pag. 194.

the absolute necessity of Pontifical election through the Conclave. They are at one in the contention that no Pope, including St. Peter, ever named his successor; and they all base their opinion upon certain Papal laws which entirely exclude such a nomination; nay, two of the above-mentioned authors go so far as to imply that this method of designation would conflict with natural and divine law, would therefore invalidate the choice of the Pontiff thus designated, and be in itself an illicit proceeding, a transgression of law; in short, the attempt so to choose a Pope is a simple practical impossibility. The Pope enjoys a plenitude of power in regulating the action of electors, but there his power stops. "Non tamen in ejus potestate est successorem ipsum designare."

But there are others holding the opposite opinion. Thus the Roman professor, Fr. Wernz, S.J., of the Gregorian University, is quite absolute in affirming that the Pope has the right to designate his successor. Wernz appears to doubt that it would be lawful to make use of this right, but he holds that it is both validly and licitly exercised when some actual, forsooth extraordinary necessity of the Church calls for it. He says that this is the more probable opinion, and that the contention of those who reject it is without foundation.[6] "Sine solido fundamento negatur Romano Pontifici jus extendi suam potestatem etiam ad immediatam sui successoris nominationem."

We have here clearly a case of doctors disagreeing. The "probabilior opinio" of one is rejected as antiquated by another; the "communior doctrina" of Sebastianelli is declared by Wernz to lack solid foundation. What are we to think of the two teachings? Both evidently cannot be correct. To which side shall we incline?

Let us examine in the first place the reasons alleged against designation. These may be reduced to three, based respectively on principles of natural law, of divine law, of ecclesiastical law.

The nature of things is appealed to when it is said that designation implies a natural impossibility, inasmuch as the Pope is dead, incapable of jurisdictional acts, at the time when, in order that the act may give to designation its effect, a successor must be

[6] *Jus Decretalium*, vol. ii, p. 651.

placed in the chair of Peter. The see is vacant, the last Pope is dead, the new incumbent must receive the tiara from other hands than those of his predecessor. *Mors omnia solvit.*

This argument, although it appealed strongly to the keen theological sense of Cajetanus, appears to me to prove too much, if it prove anything. The proof of natural testamentary power limps sadly, if we admit its general force. But in the present connection it is inapplicable; it is false from the point of view of logic. Ordinary election, it is true, supposes a dead Pope, but designation supposes a live one, who by an act placed before his death gives to his nominee a *jus ad rem*, to be transformed into a *jus in re* when the see becomes vacant. To say that the Pope must be dead before any effective measures can be taken to place a successor at least *in via ad sedem*, is to assume as already proved the point which is really at issue.

A principle of divine law is claimed to be involved when it is said that designation is something "alienum a mente Christi," or that the supreme power in the Church is not hereditary. It would be more satisfactory if some text were adduced from Holy Writ, or the record of some traditional injunction were brought forth, insisting on election and excluding designation. Until these are forthcoming, we are at liberty to question the validity of appreciations, which may be purely subjective, which may set forth not so much what the Divine Will is, as what a writer thinks it ought to be.

There remains the consideration of the ecclesiastical laws alleged against the right of designation. What is the force of this adverse legislation? We know that the Council of Antioch declared designation null and void; that St. Hilary forbade it; that Pius IV is credited with an ordinance implying that no Pope can determine his successor in office. But neither in these nor in any other document bearing on the matter can there be found anything to show that the prohibition is aught else than the declaration of purely positive ecclesiastical law. The Council of Antioch expressly states this when it says: "servetur autem jus ecclesiasticum id continens, non oportere." And the latest and most correct opinion concerning the assumed enactment of Pius IV seems to be that he never proceeded farther than to express a desire

pointing to the promulgation of the law which is ascribed to him.[7] We find him four years after the date usually given for the framing of this law, publicly expressing his belief that there existed reasons which made it desirable to have such a law enacted; language which is hardly reconcilable with a previously existing law of the same import, enacted by the same Pontiff.

But even if Pius IV had really published a law of this kind, what would we have to conclude? Why, simply that he had done what earlier authorities had done: laid down a rule which had the force—but no more—of an ecclesiastical law. Such a rule would not indeed conflict with divine law, yet at the same time need not necessarily set forth the content of divine law; it might have much to recommend it; but, like all other purely ecclesiastical laws, it might admit of exceptions, if the supreme legislative authority, the Pope, deemed exceptions necessary or really useful to the Church.

Despite Gratian's manifest opposition to the method of designation, the most cursory reading of his dictum on Cause 8, quaest. 1, will show that he did not believe designation to be against the divine law, and that he did regard the legislation prohibiting it merely in the light of an ecclesiastical regulation. It was forbidden, he says, because abuses became common, bishops choosing unworthy successors. But even after the law had been enacted, Gratian does not seem to consider designation impossible. St. Peter, he believes, designated Clement, and he concedes that the Prince of the Apostles might have imitators who would choose successors as distinguished for merit as was Clement.

Nor is there any incongruity in admitting the existence of a law requiring the process of election, or of a law expressly excluding designation, and at the same time affirming the Pope's right to choose his own successor. We are not speaking now of what method is preferable; we regard simply the absolute power resident in him who is the source and cause of what is known as Pontifical law. Christ in no wise determined the manner in which Bishops of Rome are to be chosen: this was left to ecclesiastical authority, to the Pope. Popes have legislated very freely

[7] Wernz, vol. ii, p. 653. Hollweck, *Archiv*, vol. 74. Holder, *Die Designation*. Many, *Revue de l' Institut*, 1901.

on the matter. Some of them have changed radically the law as it stood up to their day. Who will deny the possibility of other changes? And once we admit, as we must, the possibility of change, how shall we exclude designation? Limitation of the Papal power would have to be found either in Scripture or Tradition, and both are silent on the matter.

It has often been asserted that in the general failure of Popes to avail themselves of this power, we have what really amounts to an unbroken tradition in favor of election as a necessary mode of choosing a Pope. Designation has never been practised. This is the contention of Lombardi, and of all those who have preceded him in supporting the "communior opinio." Is this claim based on fact?

There seems to be no doubt that records of certain *Episcopal* designations are found in the histories of Sozomen, Rufinus, Theodoretus and the works of some of the Fathers. St. Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, designated as his successor St. Athanasius; St. Athanasius designated Peter; Valerius designated St. Augustine. And although the question in these cases is not of *Papal* designation in particular, we are authorized to draw from them the conclusion that these eminent and holy prelates who actually did designate successors in the episcopal office were far from holding the opinion that election is the only means of determining succession, or that designation is contrary to divine or natural law.

The language of Eusebius, too, has a special meaning and a special importance for us when he refers to the early occupants of the chair of St. Peter. Speaking of the appointment of more than one Pope, *e. g.*, Linus, Anacletus, Evaristus, Lucius, he uses terms which imply that papal nomination sufficed without any electoral proceedings. There is simply a transmission of power, a giving of authority, a passing from hand to hand; and not the most remote reference to election. And while in general an argument drawn from the mere language of an historical narrative might be looked at rather askance, it is well to remember that the author whom we are quoting enjoys a reputation for his accurate use of terms, and that, being himself a Bishop, he was not ignorant of the different modes of elevation to the episcopate and

of the precise words proper to each. Moreover, we must allow that when he speaks of those sees in which elections were invariably held, he uses terminology which implies election as necessarily as that to which we referred above excludes it. The presumption therefore is that Eusebius meant precisely what he said.

But have we really no closer and clearer evidence of actual papal designation, which would make the appeal to Eusebius superfluous?

There exists a record of at least one case of designation, that of Vigilius by Boniface II. But this, so far from favoring the practice, rather discountenances it. It raised such a tumult of indignation that Boniface repented of his act and nullified it. He even publicly burned the decree wherein Vigilius' promotion had been published.

Gregory VII, Victor III, Urban II, Pascal II, and certain Popes of the twelfth century are cited by some in favor of the practice of designating their successors;[8] but, in reality, it is difficult to find more than a strong recommendation in even the most preceptive of these so-called designations of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Something less ambiguous in the way of precedent is surely desirable. A clear, incontestable instance of designation will not only complete and perfect what has been said in favor of designation; it will silence all contradiction. And, indeed, such an instance has recently come to light. Since 1883 we have been in possession of documents which establish at least one case of designation, apodictically, so as to need no commentary. In that year, Amelli, an official in the Ambrosian library at Milan, discovered some manuscript *Acta* in the chapter library at Novara.[9] Critical examination has pronounced these documents authentic, and they throw a clear light on the hitherto mooted question as to the possibility of designation. They give us a plain and intelligible statement of the manner in which Boniface II was raised to the Pontificate. The historical moment is a solemn one. Pope Felix IV is at the point of death. He publicly, in the presence of the clergy, senate, and patricians of Rome, confers his pallium, the emblem of his sovereign, ecclesiastical power, on the Archdeacon

[8] Lector, *L'Election Papale*, p. 233.

[9] Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, I, p. 282.

Boniface. He declares the Archdeacon his successor. We need not stretch or torture into the desired meaning the words of the record, or exhaust the resources of interpretation, in order to gather this from the document. It states that those who refuse to recognize the validity of the Papal designation, or who fail to render due reverence, and obedience to Boniface as Pope, incur excommunication *ipso facto;* and, that none may plead ignorance of this important act, the decree which embodies it is affixed to the doors of all the churches, and sent even to King Athalaric at Ravenna.

We have here an undoubted instance of Papal designation. It is true that, at the time of its enactment, it was not received with universal favor; a very considerable party opposed Boniface, and even went to the length of electing an anti-pope, Dioscorus. But this opposition rather throws into stronger light the validity of the act of Felix. Boniface was not deposed, he still held office, despite the fact that he had never been elected; Dioscorus died but a month after his pretended election, and the recalcitrant senaators and clergy were compelled to retract publicly their disobedience to the decree of Pope Felix. There is, then, at least one example, historically vouched for, of a Pope who owed his promotion to the vote of no electoral body, but solely to a designation made by his predecessor. Is it admissible to argue, in the face of such evidence, that no Pope has ever exercised the right of designation? Can we maintain that designation is against natural or divine law? Can we deny that the comprehensive power bestowed by Christ on St. Peter and his successors embraces also the right, absolutely speaking, to determine the person of his successor, and do away with the necessity of an election? The Church has always recognized Boniface as one of her legitimate Popes, and if we deny the validity of designation, we convict her of error in a matter which, to all minds, must appear of the highest importance.

It follows, therefore, that Amelli's discovery should put an end to the controversy so far as it regards the absolute power of the Pope to designate his successor; for it can not be said that there is no clear example of designation in the history of the Church. The old argument that no Pope ever exercised this

prerogative, even when so circumstanced that its exercise would have been a great advantage to the Church, has thus lost its force; and, what is most important, no longer can it be said that designation is contrary to divine or natural law, for Felix's action, being a legislative act, affecting general discipline, cannot be questioned without implying that the Popes have erred in the interpretation of natural and divine law.

Nor does our contention weaken the argument in behalf of election as the best and safest method of providing for the Papal succession. The laws which have repeatedly been sanctioned approving the present method subserve undoubtedly the best interests of the Church, and in ordinary circumstances it would be unwise to depart from the practice. But it is one thing to recognize the propriety or advantages of a legal measure, and another to deny to the supreme legislator the right to depart from it in favor of a different mode. Whatever dangers might attend the general use of designation, it is easy to imagine conditions which would demand its use in exceptional circumstances, and in such an event we might console ourselves with the reflection that in the long line of those who have sat in the chair of St. Peter, a few only were at any time forgetful of the sanctity of their office, so as to sacrifice the general welfare of the Church to selfish interests.

JOHN T. CREAGH, D.D.

Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

CARENTIA OVARIORUM NON EST IMPEDIMENTUM MATRIMONIALE DIRIMENS.

ROGATUS a moderatore foliorum horum ut dicam, quid sentiam de cl. Doctoris Casacca O. S. A. dissertatione, cui titulus: "*Carentia Ovariorum est Impedimentum Dirimens Matrimonium,*"[1] cum sim hoc ipso tempore variis insolitis negotiis quasi quodammodo sepultus, rem optato paucioribus absolvam. Opinio in praedicta dissertatione defensa pace tanti viri, improbanda mihi videtur—id quidem ob sequentes rationes:

[1] REVIEW, vol. 27, pag. 609 sq.

1. Imprimis auctor plane confundit re ipsa impotentiam *coeundi* cum impotentia *generandi*. Adest enim discrimen *essentiale*, *substantiale* inter utramque; cl. Doctor autem cum suo cl. duce Antonelli constituit discrimen revera tantum *accidentale*: impotentiam generandi scil. *majorem* in muliere ovariis *penitus orbata*, et *minorem* in *vetula* ovariis *omnino exsiccatis* praedita, quod—nimirum *magis* et *minus*—non mutat speciem.

Jamvero impotentia *coeundi* est impotentia habendi *copulam perfectam*, et est impedimentum matrimonii dirimens. Impotentia *generandi* est impotentia habendi *prolem*, seu *sterilitas*, et nullum prorsus est impedimentum matrimonii, quamvis sit *absoluta*; uti patet in vetula femina e. gr. nonaginta annorum, quae etsi omnino et absolute impotens sit ad generandum propter absolutam atrophiam seu exsiccationem ovariorum, nihilominus secundum omnes theologos, etiam adversarios,[2] licite init matrimonium, dummodo copula perfecta in ea fieri possit, i. e. dummodo habeat *vas debitum*, in quo per penetrationem penis, (s. v. v.), semen virile *recipere* possit, etiamsi nequeat idem semen *retinere*. Impotentia coeundi, ut est impedimentum dirimens, definiri potest cum cl. Eschbach:[3] "Antecedens ac perpetua conjugum inaptitudo ad copulam perfectam, qua scil. vir, naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit." Et haec definitio mire convenit cum ea, quam exhibet cl. A. S. Taylor, M.D.:[4] "Impotency is defined to be a (permanent) incapacity for sexual intercourse," et: "Sterility is usually defined to be the inability to procreate, or a want of aptitude in the female for impregnation." . . . "In reference to women, sterility implies that condition in which there is an 'inability to conceive.' This appears to be the true meaning of the term, and the sense in which it is used not only by the best writers, but in common phraseology."[5] Eam-

[2] Qui heic sibi non constant, cum *atrophiam* organorum essentialium doceant esse impotentiam, et tamen vetulis atrophia etiam absoluta ovariorum ex senectute laborantibus matrimonium permittere debeant. *Cf.* REVIEW, l. c., p. 612 § *Hisce praejactis.*

[3] *Disputationes Physiologico-Theologicae*, ed. 2, pag. 190, ubi cl. vir definitionem editionis *primae* jure merito *reformavit.*

[4] *Manual of Medical Jurisprudence*, ed. 12, Americana, cura Clark Bell, apud Lea Bros. & Co. New York et Philadelphia, 1897, p. 652.

[5] *Ibid.*, pag. 661.

dem definitionem quoque habet Irving Browne,[6] scil. "Impotence means physical incapacity; . . . Barrenness constitutes no incapacity, nor does any malformation not preventing copulation,[7] nor any curable disability." Idem docet W. A. Owen[8] ex Schouler, sec. 16, videlicet: "What is such impotency as amounts to a disqualification? Such sexual defects as render copulation impossible; but not such as merely cause a failure of conception."

2. In cl. Doctoris dissertatione nulla invenitur responsio ad valde doctam et gravem opinionis ejus refutationem, quam profert cl. Eschbach tum in variis locis operis praeclarissimi supra allegati, tum in *Analectis Ecclesiasticis*[9] Romae Moderatore Mgr. Cadène editis.

3. Opinio cl. Doctoris contradicit verae doctrinae scholae hucusque traditae. Exemplo sint principes. (a) S. Thomas docet:[10] "Conceditur eis" (scil. senibus) "matrimonium, secundum quod est *in remedium*, quamvis *non* competat eis secundum quod est *in officium naturae*." (b) S. Bonaventura idem tradit:[11] "Ad illud quod objicitur de bono prolis, quod propter hoc institutum est; dicendum, quod non tantum propter hoc, sed etiam in *remedium* et in *signum*; et ideo, *quamvis non sit ibi hoc bonum*,[12] possunt tamen esse alia bona. Si autem homo stetisset, tunc semper fuisset hoc bonum, quia tantum fuisset in *officium*; et hoc bonum non deesset, quia nulla esset sterilitatis poena." (c) Idem profitetur Sanchez:[13] "Imo (Ecclesia) passim admittit senes ad illud ineundum, cum tamen eorum semen *constet* esse sterile.... Tandem, quia, etsi matrimonium *frustretur* fine primario, qui est prolis generatio, consequitur tamen finem secundarium,

[6] *On Domestic Relations*, ed. 2, p. 5. Boston, 1890.

[7] Certo requiruntur et vas *debitum* et copula *perfecta*.

[8] Owen's *Law Quizzer*, p. 227, qu. 8. Toledo, Ohio, 1898.

[9] De novo quodam sterilitatis conceptu, vol. x, 1902, p. 85 sq., et reliquae partes deinceps interrupte per totum volumen sequuntur.

[10] *Suppl.* q. 58 art. 1, ad 3.

[11] *Sent.* Lib. 4. Dist. 31, art. 1, qu. 3. Ed. novissima. Quaracchi, 1889. Tom. iv, p. 721.

[12] Scil. prolis.

[13] *De Matr.* L. 7, disp. 92, n. 25. Legesis *totum* numerum.

nempe *satisfacere concupiscentiae, vera copula habita ;* quod *ad ejus valorem sufficit.* Et ita sustinet D. Thomas, receptus passim ab omnibus theologis et Iuris Pontificii professoribus, demptis paucis, ... quos optime impugnat Barbosa.

Nec obstant argumenta pro ipsis adducta. Quia ad *primum,* neganda est consequentia. Nam quando est *impotentia ad copulam,* neuter matrimonii finis reperiri potest. At quando est *sola sterilitas, salvatur* finis secundarius. . . . . Ad *quartum* dic, eum textum[14] aperte loqui, quando *in pactum deducitur* in matrimonii *contractu, ut* proles vitetur. Tunc enim irritum est matrimonium, illud vitiante conditione ipsius bono contraria."

(d) Quibus manifesto consentit S. Alphonsus noster cum Busenbaum declarans:[15] "Valide contrahunt steriles, quia, etsi SINT *impotentes ad generationem,* non tamen ad copulam; atque adeo sunt capaces omnis juris et obligationis matrimonii; et *susceptio prolis, licet sit praecipuus, non tamen est unicus, nec* IMMEDIATUS *finis* matrimonii."

4. Difficultates a cl. Doctore contra sententiam nostram motae facile diluuntur.

(a) Cl. Doctor argumentatur:[16] "Nefas esset adserere matrimonium subsistere posse *tantummodo* propter sedandam concupiscentiam, exclusa etiam possibilitate illius finis primarii."

Resp. Et nihilosecius S. Alphonsus[17] et tot ac tanti cum eo theologi tenent: "Si licet ergo petere TANTUM ad vitandam incontinentiam, licebit etiam *ob eumdem finem matrimonium inire.*" Quinimo non dubitat Divus Alphonsus affirmare matrimonium post lapsum *magis immediate* concessum esse in *remedium,* adeo ut si *desit* in re etiam *possibilitas* prolis, ob *remedium* possit iniri.[18]

(b) Cl. Doctor pergit:[19] "Stat igitur quod physiologi una voce proclamant, scil. ovaria et ovulum esse in feminis, quod testiculi et semen sunt in homine. Et sicut homines castrati utroque testiculo sunt impotentes; ita feminae carentes ovariis."

[14] D. Aug. lib. *de bono conjug.* c. 5.
[15] *Theol. Mor.* l. 6, n. 1095. Res. 2.
[16] REV., l. c., p. 611.
[17] L. 6, n. 882, magis versus finem.
[18] Cf. supra sub 3.
[19] REV., l.c., p. 613.

Resp.—Cum cl. Eschbach:[20] "*Distinguo Antecedens;* in ordine ad prolificationem, praehabita copula: *Concedo;* in ordine ad copulam ipsam: *Nego.* Item *distinguo Consequens;* Excisis testiculis vir arcetur a matrimonio quia jam impotens est ad copulam conjugalem perfectam: *Concedo;* formaliter quia impotens est ad generationem: *Nego.* . . . Sane, quod sub respectu generationis, h. e. ut novus homo concipiatur, aequali necessitate requirantur ovulum ex ovario decisum atque sperma in testiculis confectum, neminem latet. Ast, si ad carnalem copulam respiciatur, quam maxima datur dissimilitudo. Sine spermate nulla conjugalis copula; imo citra hanc illud spargere numquam licet. Ovulum autem femineum semel maturum, seclusa copula carnali, ex ovario singulis mensibus secernitur atque, natura duce, in secessum abit. Quare modo adsit, modo desit ovulum, mulier ad conjugale debitum semper prompta est. Haec cum ita sint, argumentum cogens dici omnino nequit."

Neve "mulieres excisas" compares viris eunuchis, quibus, declarante Sixto V, jure naturae denegandum est matrimonium.

Resp., lex illa Sixtina "est odiosa, quam citra cogentes rationes extendere non licet" ad mulieres. Caeterum ob duo Sixtus V declaravit eunuchis negandum esse matrimonium: "Nos attendentes, ait, quod qui *frigidae sunt naturae*, etc. Et insuper considerantes quod ex hujusmodi conjugiis *nulla utilitas provenit*, etc." Porro neutra haec Pontificis consideratio ad mulieres excisas pertinet. Sane quoad primum, una est tum veterum tum recentiorum vox, frigiditatem nil impedimenti in feminis creare, quominus viros admittant atque matres familias fiant. Vae si secus dicendum foret, cum, experientia duce, centenae videantur uxores rei conjugali aegre et absque libidine operam dantes. De altero quod Pontificem movit, supra diximus (id) verissimum esse, nihilque utile, in ordine etiam ad secundarium matrimonii finem, eunuchorum conjugia habere; imo haec essentialiter esse continuae et numquam satiatae "libidinis incentiva."

Toto coelo autem ab istis conjugium distat inter virum copulae perfectae capacem atque mulierem excisam; nam utrique conjugum id vertitur in plenam finis alterius consecutionem. Quoad virum, res in plano est; quoad uxorem etiam ex supra dictis[21]

[20] L. c. p. 198.

[21] L. c. p. 159.

facile intelligitur. Summam enim satiativam delectationem femina non ex decisione ovuli accipit, sed ex carnali copula utrimque perfecta. 'Laissons donc, ait laudatus physiologus,[22] une analogie *impossible au point de vue érotique* entre les testicules et les ovaires.'.... Ulterius masculi castrati semifeminae habentur; feminae autem ovariis carentes apparenter a caeteris feminis vix discrepant. Sub respectu demum venerei sensus, 'tout un monde les sépare,' ait Roubaud, scil. mulieres excisas ab eunuchis. Feminis enim voluptatis fons essentialis aut origo ovarium non est, neque ex eo ovuli decisio; sed (s. v. v.), mentula potius quam clitorim vocant, atque interna vaginae mucosa superficies nervis cerebralibus perfusa, ita ut, cum sub erotico influxu haec sic dicto femineo semine inundatur, mulier maximam voluptatem experiatur, quam mox venereorum organorum prolapsus seu quiescentia excipit. Quare ajunt physiologi, 'que l'ovaire émette ou non son ovule, le plaisir est le même;' imo docent se in explorandis meretricum cadaveribus aliquando invenisse nonnisi rudimentaria ovaria habentes." Ita cl. Eschbach utroque loco citato. Ignoscat mihi castus lector illa paullo latius exscripta, nam ad plenam rei intelligentiam ea omnino opportuna et necessaria esse duxi.

(c) Decisiones S. Officii[23] non integrae referuntur. In priore Decisione de die 3 Febr. 1887 S. Officium dixit: "*Re mature diuque perpensa*,[24] matrimonium mulieris, de quo in casu, non esse impediendum."[25] In secunda Decisione vel potius *Decreto* de die 30 Julii 1890 ad dubium, quod jam *die 30 Octobris 1889* propositum fuerat, dicitur: "Num mulier N. N., cui operatione chirurgica ablata sunt duo ovaria et uterus, admitti possit ad matrimonium contrahendum? Et, *re mature perpensa*,[26] Eminentissimi Domini Cardinales una mecum Inquisitores Generales *decreverunt:*[26] "Matrimonium non esse impediendum. Quod dum A. T. pro istius curiae norma significo, etc.[27]"

S. Officium igitur *mature diuque* rem perpendit in utroque dubio, et in solutione dubii secundi usurpatur vox: EE. DD. Cardinales "*decreverunt.*" Iterata haec Decisio nescio an sit *mera* declaratio legis generalis, an secus; at vero recte applicatur ab omni-

[22] D. Bossu.

[23] Rev., l. c., p. 614.

[24] Haec verba omittuntur a cl. Doctore.

[25] Rev., vol. 5, p. 304.

[26] Item haec omittuntur, ut supra.

[27] *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. 27, p. 128.

bus in omnibus ejusmodi casibus. Idem enim Card. D'Annibale, cujus principia de interpretatione ac promulgatione decretorum a cl. Doctore[28] in contrarium allegantur, tunc temporis *Assessoris hujus S. Officii* munere fungens et ipse profecto satis intelligens principia illa hac de re a se statuta, Decisiones illas S. Officii interpretatus est hunc in modum:[29] "Nubere non prohibetur mulier, cui utrumque ovarium *penitus* exsectum fuit (S. U. I. 3 Febr. 1887).[30] Scil. matrimonium ad *mutuum quoque vitae adjutorium pertinet, et ad concupiscentiam coercendam.*" Eodem modo Génicot, Theol. Mor. II, n. 503, 3°, cujus principia interpretationis etiam a cl. Doctore in contrarium afferuntur.[31] Et Lehmkuhl,[32] theologus sane praestantissimus, "licet ipse *contrarium ex sua opinione tenuisset,*" tamen post Decisiones illas scribit: "Sed S. Inquisitio videtur hos defectus pro sola sterilitate habere; proin *causae non sunt fideles inquietandi.*"

Deinde, quoad *solemnem publicationem* a cl. Doctore requisitam,[33] eodem argumento praeclari quidam theologi usi sunt de valore Decreti S. Off. de die 23 Iunii 1886 circa absolutionem a casibus papalibus; at frustra. Nam Decreta posteriora argumentum illud funditus everterunt.[34] Qua de causa *Il Monitore*[35] scribere non dubitavit: "Hodie extra dubium positum est pro legibus ecclesiasticis sufficere promulgationem Romae factam in *qualicumque forma* (aut affingendo ad portas solitas, aut publicando in variis dicasteriis seu tribunalibus, aut eas notas faciendo per typos publicos seu *public press*), ut omnes et statim obligent."

Optimi igitur theologi, inter quos ipse Assessor S. Officii tempore Decisionum, Decisiones illas tamquam vim universalem

[28] Rev., l. c., p. 614.

[29] *In eadem Summula Theol. Mor.*, Vol. 3, n. 431, nota 9, ed. 3.

[30] Heic, teste Eschbach (l. c. p. 204) in ed. 4, adduntur haec: seu "quae sterilis effecta est per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum, quia sterilitas non idem est ac impotentia (contrahendi matrimonium)."

[31] Rev., l. c., p. 614.

[32] *Theol. Mor.* II, n. 744. ed. 9.

[33] Rev., l. c., p. 614.

[34] Cfr. Putzer, *Comm.* n. 144.

[35] Vol. 12, p. 172. Ex Italico idiomate. "Oggidì dunque è fuori dubbio che per le leggi ecclesiastiche baste la promulgazione fatta a Roma in qualunque forma (o con affigerle alle solite porte, o con pubblicarle nei varii dicasteri, con farle note per la pubblica stampa) perchè in tutti e subito inducano obbligazione."

habentes acceperunt, et jure merito. Etenim, ubi S. Officium non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus. Quare ingenue fateor me omnino consentire confessario illi, qui in casu a cl. Doctore allato[36] noluit "impedire" matrimonium Fabiae cum Fabio, nec me posse approbare decisionem parochi atque episcopi, quia ipsi nullum habuerunt jus impediendi matrimonium Fabiae propter solam carentiam ovariorum.

(d) Prosequitur cl. Doctor:[37] "Sed insuper S. Congregatio multoties declaravit, omnesque theologi unanimiter tenent, matrimonium sub conditione evitandae prolis contractum esse invalidum, ob exclusionem rei contractui conjugali essentialis. Quomodo vero nunc matrimonium, ex S. Congregationis decisione, validum esset, si mulier omnino careat ovariis, quae tam essentialia sunt generationi?"

Responsio est admodum facilis, et jam data est a S. Bonaventura loco supra sub 3 citato.[38] Videlicet ad difficultatem sibi objectam, nempe: "Item, quod bonum *prolis* de necessitate consequatur matrimonium, videtur: 3. Quia dicit Augustinus, et habetur in littera, quod 'qui venena sterilitatis procuraverint non sunt conjuges'; 4. Item *ratione* videtur: quia ad hoc institutum fuit matrimonium, scilicet ad crescendum et multiplicandum: ergo frustra est, si hoc fine caret; sed non potest esse omnino frustra, cum sit Sacramentum: ergo etc.[39] Item, quod bonum *fidei* etc."—Ad hanc difficultatem, inquam, Doctor Seraphicus ita respondet: "Si autem loquamur quantum ad *matrimonii contractum*, qui est per matrimonialem consensum; sic potest esse contractus *absque his duobus bonis*,[40] ut puta in sterilibus et in continentibus, sed tamen (*al.* si tamen) non est *contra haec*. Tunc autem est consensus *contra haec*, quando sub *tali pacto consentitur*, *ut* prolis sterilitas procuretur, vel uxor alii prostituatur; tunc enim non est consensus vel *pactio matrimonii*, sed *adulterii*, cum directe repugnet institutioni matrimonii. Sed *carentia* sive absentia horum duorum non repugnat; quia *fides* venit ex recto matrimonii usu;

[36] Rev., l. c., p. 618.
[37] Rev., l. c., p. 615.
[38] Opera omnia, Tom. IV, p. 720.
[39] Nonne hoc est palmare argumentum adversariorum acutissime positum?
[40] Scil. prolis et fidei.

et quia possunt homines abuti ipso, ideo potest deesse fides. Similiter *proles* venit ex fructu ventris; et quia steriles possunt esse vel natura, vel ARTE:[41] *ideo matrimonium hoc bono potest* CARERE."

Id ipsum tradit Doctor Angelicus:[42] "*Alio modo* possunt considerari fides, et proles, secundum quod sunt in suis principiis, ut pro prole accipiatur *intentio prolis*, et pro fide debitum servandi fidem, sine quibus etiam matrimonium esse non potest, quia haec in matrimonio ex ipsa pactione conjugali causantur; ita *quod si aliquid contrarium his exprimeretur in consensu*, qui matrimonium facit, non esset verum matrimonium; et SIC accipiendo fidem, et prolem, constat quod proles est essentialissimum in matrimonio, et secundo fides, et tertio Sacramentum."

Neque aliter Sanchez, cfr. supra sub **3.**

Verbo: *Conditio evitandae* prolis consensui matrimoniali, tamquam *vera conditio consensus* huius, annexa[43] utique vitiat ipsam *essentiam* contractus matrimonialis, scil. jus (saltem juridicum seu radicale[44]—mutuum, exclusivum, perpetuum) exigendi debitum cum pari obligatione reddendi, seu *jus* ad *perfectam copulam*, ac propterea invalidat matrimonium;—at sola *carentia* ovariorum etiam *arte* facta, utpote *mera sterilitas*, concomitans contractum matrimonialem nunquam, ratione impedimenti impotentiae tantum habita, matrimonium invalidat, dummodo adsit *vas debitum* in muliere, et *potentia coeundi* in utroque.

(e) Decisiones S. Congregationis Concilii a cl. Doctore allatae[45] nullo modo contradicunt Decisionibus S. Officii nec sententiae nostrae; sed eas contra confirmant. Nam in istis mulieribus, quae a S. Congregatione Concilii impotentes declaratae sunt, *semper defuit vas debitum, ergo potentia coeundi!*

(f) Quod ex cl. Bucceroni, S. J., allegatur[46] de privata declaratione Secretarii S. Officii, nequit evertere publicas S. Officii Decisi-

[41] Nota hoc verbum vigilans. Hercule sane S. Doctor animo suo acutissimo chirurgicas aetatis nostrae operationes multo ante praesensisse videtur!

[42] *Suppl.* qu 49. art. 3.

[43] Seu *in pactum deducta.*

[44] Gasparri, *De Matr.*, n. 858 et n. 1057.

[45] REV., l. c., p. 615.

[46] REV., l. c., p. 616.

ones, quas Card. D'Annibale, ipso istarum Decisionum tempore *Assessor* ejusdem S. Officii, prorsus aliter interpretatus est. Huc facere videtur, quod cl. Vermeersch, S.J., ad idem in alia re argumentum *Ephemeridum Liturg.*,—scil. "Ex iis quae accepimus in S. Rituum et Indicis Secretaria confirmamur in nostra sententia,"—scripsit:[47] "Non putamus ab ipsis *Ephem. Liturg.* illud serio urgeri. Num velint enim,—quando non pauci jam dolent, nimis hodie a pluribus, neglectis principiis, ex *sola* jurisprudentia repeti quaestionum solutiones,—quasi novum introducere fontem juris: privatam nempe interrogationem et vivae vocis oraculum alicujus officialis secretariae? Quam parum haec ratio prodesset scientiae canonicae, id sapientis Lectoris arbitrio permittimus. Nec eamdem gratam vel acceptam esse futuram ipsis spectatissimis viris qui in S. R. Congregationibus occupantur: pluris facimus horum sapientiam et doctrinam, quam ut de hoc dubitemus."

(g) Quod plures apprime egregii Professores Romani[48] opinionem cl. Doctoris docent, eam minime reddit veram. Nonne plures celeberrimi Theologi Romani olim mordicus defendebant craniotomiam et embryotomiam esse licitam; et nihilominus hanc ipsam opinionem S. Sedes postea penitus reprobavit atque damnavit?

(h) Denique cl. Doctor adjungit:[49] "Quid tandem dicendum de moralitate oppositae sententiae? Neminem latet ipsam onanismi crimini viam latissimam aperire," et hujus rei rationem assignat quia sacramentum matrimonii "non amplius esset, nisi concupiscentiarum illecebra."

Resp. 1. Hoc argumentum nimium probat, ergo nihil probat. Nam ex *abusu* alicujus rei non potest probari ejusdem rei immoralitas. Si propter abusum alicujus rei damnanda esset ipsa res ejusve usus, actum esset profecto de sacrosanctis Sacramentis, saluberrimis illis salutis nostrae remediis, quibus tot homines ad perniciem suam aeternam abutuntur! Actum esset de Sacramento potissimum Matrimonii, quo tot homines ad nefandum onanismi scelus aliaque horribilia patranda abutuntur! Suntne propterea rejicienda sacrosancta Sacramenta, ac praecipue etiam

[47] *De Prohib. et Censura Librorum*, ed 2, 1898, p. 72, nota 4.
[48] REV., l. c., p. 616. [49] REV., l. c., p. 617.

Sacramentum Matrimonii, ab iisque homines arcendi? Quod omen avertat Deus noster benignissimus!

2. Argumentum laborat falso supposito: supponit enim copulam cum *muliere ovariis penitus orbata* esse de se seu objective onanisticam. Quod suppositum ita *Distinguo:* copula cum muliere *ovariis penitus orbata* est onanistica: *opere, Nego;* quia copula ipsa de se est *perfecta;* est onanistica: *mente,* si revera copulam illam exercentes generationem impedire *intenderent: Concedo;* secus: *Nego.* Estne copula cum vetula muliere, cujus *ovaria* sunt *penitus exsiccata,*—id quod in casu *concreto singulari* Titiae vel Camillae tandem aliquando certo determinari potest,—de se onanistica? Minime sane ex constanti praxi Ecclesiae, fatentibus etiam adversariis. Ergo logice *a pari* nec copula cum muliere, cujus ovaria sunt *penitus exstirpata,* de se onanistica esse potest.

3. Duce cl. Lehmkuhl,[50] data saltem occasione, nupturientes ac conjuges imprimis ultro verbis castissimis moneamus, doceamus, metu judicii divini perterreamus oportet omnino, clamantes: "Velle excisionem istam ad id solum, ut inducatur sterilitas atque commercii sexualis facultas sine timore prolis concipiendae, gravissimum est peccatum."—At, post factum, ne judicemus ex *affectibus cordis,* sed ex *principiis mentis.* Poteritne severitas immodica, nulla justa ratione fundata, coercere homines illos flagitiosissimos ac perditissimos, qui, non tam intra, quam extra castra nostra versantes, nullum libidinis suae explendae adjumentum perhorrescunt? Sententia igitur nostra nec minima laborat immoralitate, nec viam aperit onanismo, sed contra plane convenit principiis moralitatis ac doctrinae et praxi Ecclesiae hucusque traditae.

Quare, praeeunte cl. Eschbach aliisque, dicendum est: Melior est conditio possidentis, scil. libertatis mulieris ovariis orbatae,[51] quae ante hanc orbationem facultatem ineundi matrimonium habuisse supponitur, quam possidere pergit, donec contrarium certo probetur; atque quoniam non debet quisquam vel magis Catholicus esse vel plus sapere quam Roma ipsa, omnium magistra, auctoribus tot theologis concludendum est cum S. Officio:

[50] *Theol. Mor.* Vol. II, n. 856.

[51] Quarum non paucae saepe *insciae invitaeve* ovariis uteroque spoliantur, quod sacerdotes sacro ministerio operam dantes possunt attestari.

Mulieris, cui operatione chirurgica ablata sunt vel duo ovaria vel duo ovaria et uterus, matrimonium non esse impediendum; verumtamen simul proclamandum est cum S. Congregatione Concilii: Mulieris omnis, cui *deest vas debitum*, matrimonium propter impotentiam coeundi esse invalidum.

JOSEPH C. HILD, C.SS.R.

Ilchestria, in Md.

LEO XIII AND STUDENTS OF THE BIBLE.

SOME months ago the Sovereign Pontiff authorized the organization of a Council or Commission which was to act as a central tribunal for the guidance and promotion of Biblical Studies. By a recent Apostolic Letter,[1] this Commission received not only its official sanction, but the policy and future method of action to be adopted by its members in the exposition of the Sacred Scriptures, were clearly indicated. The object which is to be kept in view is threefold: Assiduous and thorough study of the Sacred Text; well reasoned interpretation by which its meaning becomes clear in the light of well defined faith; and temperate but all-sided defence of the inspired character of the Bible against the destructive criticism of modern science and scepticism.

STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

The purpose for which the Bible is read and studied is in the main twofold. It serves us in the first place for edification, by showing us God's ways with men in the past, and it contains a record of His precepts and also of His promises. But it serves likewise as a defence of our faith. It is a text-book to which we may ever refer in order to keep hold of and verify principles and truths taught us by our living teacher, the Church, through whom the Holy Ghost was to speak to men everywhere to the end of time.

The right understanding of the Sacred Writings helps, of course, very much both to the cultivation of a proper spirit of

[1] See Text of the Letter under ANALECTA in this number.

devotion, and to a just appreciation of our holy faith by which we come to know God, to see ourselves in Him as in a clear mirror, and to learn to transform ourselves by correction of our defects and by imitation of His likeness so far as our created nature permits. But to fully understand the Bible, both as to its intended general purpose which makes it serve us as a manual of devout reading, and again as to the meaning of its different passages and words, it is requisite to have a certain amount of human learning. The many books of which the Bible is composed were written in a language to which most of us are now strangers; they were written for people in remote times and places, very different from us in habits of thought and feeling, and in the expression of both. For although we may all learn certain truths from the inspired pages, they were not all intended for us; they were addressed in the first place to Israelites in the desert, and then to Hebrews living in community in Palestine, and then to Jews dispersed or in captivity throughout Asia and Africa, and then to the Jewish converts who followed the Messias, and finally to the Greek and Roman Christians of the Apostolic age. And as we learn truth from the study of ancient history, and principles from the wise maxims of the old philosophers, so we learn, with much greater force, truth and principles from the instructions given to the Jews and the Greeks and Romans by careful reading and study of things which tell of God's dealings with them. I say we learn truth and principles from the sacred books with much greater force, because we have the assurance that these instructions, covering different ages, and made in the first place for different nations, all proceeded from God; that they were inspired by special command. Hence we reverence them, even when we do not understand their complete meaning and full force, just as posterity reverences the written instructions of some great ancestor, though the document is in a language which men of the day can hardly decipher or understand. They know it is the handwriting of their sire, and if they can read it only partially they will reverence it and obey the injunctions which they understand it contains, if these be interpreted to them by the proper authority. This authority, our parent, our teacher interpreting to us the document which contains the story of our heavenly Father's dealings with the chil-

dren of men in times past, which records certain injunctions and teachings of wisdom that are of everlasting application to all generations, is Holy Church.

Now the Church, whilst she has a divine commission to instruct us, and to this end is guided by the Divine Spirit acting as the living principle of her communion, being on earth, for men, and composed of men representing the divine authority, must use the instruments of human knowledge as the means of communicating the inspired truth. She must equip her leaders and instructors with the apparatus to demonstrate the truth, and with the weapons to defend its heritage. This she does by such means as the present tribunal or Commission composed of scholars who are to devote themselves to the exposition of the Sacred Scriptures with unity of purpose, and systematically, and with just attention to the demands of truth both in the supernatural and the natural order.

It might be asked why such a Commission representing the Church as teacher of the Sacred Text had not been appointed long ago, since we have had the Bible for centuries. I might answer: for a reason analagous to that which prevented the United States from organizing a Naval Academy before the year 1845, though there was abundance of sea on which enemies could have attacked it during seventy previous years of its commonwealth. So far as any necessity existed in the economy of the Church's life as a teacher of religious truth and a guardian of morality, she did have a tribunal which both guided and decided in matters of Scriptural authority and interpretation. Her whole liturgy, her text-books of theology and controversy, are evidence of this fact, which is often lost sight of because it does not assume the position of "the Bible alone" as the source of Catholic faith and obedience. The charges of Bible-Christianism against the Church are based on the implied exclusion of the Church's living representation of God's will and wisdom. They are like the charges of the deserter from his army when he appeals against the action of a court and jury to the freedom of opinion guaranteed in the written constitution of the land. Indeed our written Constitution, the Bible, was being constantly, interpreted in the Catholic Church, because its spirit, its maxims and expressions pervaded all her teaching, and its history was made the very basis of her

instructive liturgy from the beginning of the year to the end. This Protestants do not, as a rule, understand; they argue that we do not reverence the written law of God because, living in the intimate spirit of its perpetual traditions, we do not quote a text as motive for each deed we perform. Every priest and religious, bound to recite the canonical office, all over the earth where the Church holds a foot, reads, and pledges himself by the oath of ordination to read, day by day, such portion of the Sacred Scriptures as will complete, within the circle of the year's daily round, the entire Bible. The parts are carefully portioned out to him by a "directory," so that he has no choice; and in order that he might be induced to reflect on what he reads each day, and draw some practical lesson from it for his own guidance, there is added a chapter (nocturn) of interpretations and prayers which also he is bound to go over—not with a mere glance of the eye, but pronouncing every word with his lips, lest he begin ever to think lightly of that duty. Strangers often wonder when they see a priest in railway car or landing, walking or waiting, with the little, well-thumbed book in his hand, all absorbed in the volume, yet without the sanctimonious air of one that prays for the public gaze. What is this genial and matter-of-fact priest doing? He is reading a fixed portion of the Bible, for he must complete it, whatever other duty encompass him at home or abroad before the midnight watch is past. And what he reads in that little book of the Roman Breviary, is incorporated in the liturgy of the Mass, and the faithful can follow it; it is the meaning of the Calendar with its rubrics and colors, as the readers of THE DOLPHIN find it in each issue and in their missals.

Thus the study of the Sacred Scriptures has been fostered, silently, constantly, thoroughly in the daily service of the Church, and like a tree that grows without noise, without perceptible motion, this study has produced the fruit of reverence for the Sacred Text, among Catholics, whilst it is now quickly disappearing among those who at one time claimed the "Bible alone" as the source of revealed religion.

CRITICISM.

Within the last century there has, indeed, arisen outside of the

Catholic Church a new spirit, a temper of criticism with regard to the Bible. This spirit, with its constant carpings invited by free investigation, threatens to deprive the organic growth of Revelation, with its oral and written tradition, of its vital protection.

Protestantism, in leaving it to the individual judgment to determine the sense of what God teaches in the Bible, has opened the gate to a destructive criticism which looks upon the Sacred Books as it looks upon profane history, adjudging many of its statements to be myth and fable, and altogether misleading. And because this attack upon the Sacred Books is backed by a show of erudition which influences the mind of the less learned, the Church, as guardian of her faithful children, seeks to prevent the spread of this attractive and infectious criticism within the fold. Therefore she now finds it necessary to take up arms which she never used before, in order that she might defend the divine origin and the authorized interpretation of the Sacred Volume.

The arms of defence forced into the hands of the Church by the new method of her enemies' attacks are—the critical examination of the human or historic evidence which vouches for or at least indicates the true origin of the Sacred Books. The proof that they are genuine contributes of course in its measure to their right understanding, because it furnishes the historic background and the light of contemporary intelligence, feeling, and habits which interpret the forms of expression used by God's messengers to instruct the children of men in their duty toward Him. This is in fact the province of what is called the "Higher Criticism" as distinguished from the "Lower Criticism," which, leaving out of account or taking for granted the origin and authenticity of the Sacred Books, only deals with the interpretation of the words.

Now it is very plain that this examination or criticism is what the Holy Father urges Bible students to take up earnestly. Hence it is untrue what has been said by some too zealous Catholic writers, namely, that the Sovereign Pontiff, in his Encyclical of 1893 on the Study of the Sacred Scriptures, condemned the aims of the Higher Criticism. What Leo censures in that document is not the investigations of the Higher Criticism, but rather that particular method of certain leaders in its school who rely for their conclusions mainly if not entirely upon *internal* evidence, which means

the evidence of their own private judgment. This indeed is still the Pontiff's attitude, as is plain from the second point emphasized in the more recent Apostolic Letter, namely, that, while we are to pursue fearless inquiry and open facing of facts which seem to make against the authentic value of the Sacred Scriptures, we are nevertheless to be cautious so as not to accept the conclusions of every prominent scholar in Biblical research.

A Wise Caution.

How very justified this warning is may easily be demonstrated from the results to which the great leaders of the Higher Criticism have brought their followers.

Let us only remember what the representatives of Biblical criticism outside the Church have done during the century just past, and to what conclusion their judgments regarding the historical authenticity of the Bible has brought their followers. I take the three principal leaders of the rationalist school as sign posts of the most learned and acute criticism looked up to by every Biblical scholar of Europe—Semler, a little over a hundred years ago; Bauer, fifty years ago; and Harnack, most prominent in our day. Professor Semler, with all the apparatus of historical and linguistic learning, examines the list of books in our Bible, and then concludes that certain books—*ex. gr.*, The Apocalypse—were surely not written in the apostolic age.[2] Professor Bauer, with increased apparatus and greater historical and linguistic learning, examines the list of books in our Bible, and he concludes that only five books are undoubtedly *genuine;* but among the five is the Apocalypse, which his learned predecessor upon the same intrinsic evidence pronounces *spurious.* Now comes Professor Harnack, of the Berlin University, and after careful examination of the New Testament writings concludes with the same oracular assurance that characterized the utterances of his two immortalized predecessors, Semler and Bauer, who contradicted each other, by asserting that both were wrong. Who then is right? The Catholic tradition which gives us the only true source of primitive Christianity. So says Professor Harnack when he states that the chronological framework in which tradition has arranged the books of the

[2] *Cf.* Abhandlung v. d. freien Untersuchung d. Canons.

Bible "compels the historian to disregard all hypotheses as to the historical sequence of things which deny this framework." Thus the Apocalypse must be admitted to be safe in the eyes of Professor Harnack's followers.

I have cited merely at random an instance of marked differences among the representatives of the so-called Higher Criticism which any Catholic student of Sacred Scripture is likely to meet with among a thousand of similar character. Yet the fact that the men who utter these views enjoy national reputation for special erudition gives to all their statements an air of authority which commands respect and open assent among the host of those who cannot afford to be original. Intellectual servility is as common as the social servility which dotes on the pretensions of the higher class. Nor is this tendency confined to non-Catholics, with whom freedom of opinion and private judgment in religious matters have the force of a principle, so that their inconsistency does not convict them at any time of actual wrong.

Catholic teachers and writers have now and then been beguiled by the sound of great names and were thus led to exaggerate the force of adverse criticism. Probably the late Professor Mivart's case, which we cite without odium, is one of the best known instances of a tendency more dangerous in its results than is commonly admitted. To take seriously an objection which is nothing more than a cleverly constructed hypothesis is to weaken one's argument to the very root; for it not only admits as true what is not so, but it implies that we have no argument which excludes such hypothesis. With the uneducated, who can only judge of the plausibility of such argumentation, it becomes the seed of doubt and scepticism, and it destroys in them eventually all faith in revelation. It is rarely acknowledged by men of scientific attainment that an extreme conservatism in matters of religion is a far safer disposition for the attainment of ultimate truth about God than the venturesome spirit of criticism. The mind that fears, even excessively, to err from an established path in the matter of truths that lie beyond its ordinary reach is more disposed, as a rule, to be guided by authority, when the latter happens to interpret revelation; whilst the scientific mind in the progress of its investigation acquires that confidence in its own

strength which is apt to overleap itself and fall from the safe path of faith. Hence the Pontiff wisely warns the student not to follow every cry and sign of novelty in Scriptural investigation. At the same time he urges him, under the initiative and guidance furnished by the Council on Scripture Studies, to make himself thoroughly familiar with the position of the critics who oppose the Bible, and to equip himself with all the apparatus of learning to be obtained in the storehouse of history, philology, physical and mental science so far as these studies serve to interpret and defend the sacred word of God.

This let us endeavor to do. THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN will faithfully coöperate with the design of the Sovereign Pontiff and the Biblical Commission as a continuous organ of these Sacred Studies for the clergy and of an earnest and thoughtful laity.

THE EDITOR.

Analecta.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAE XIII

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

Quibus Consilium Instituitur Studiis Sacrae Scripturae Provehendis

LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Vigilantiae studiique memores, quo *depositum fidei* Nos quidem longe ante alios sartum tectumque praestare pro officio debemus, litteras encyclicas *Providentissimus Deus* anno MDCCCXCIII dedimus quibus complura de studiis Scripturae sacrae data opera complectebamur. Postulabat enim excellens rei magnitudo atque utilitas, ut istarum disciplinarum rationibus optime, quoad esset in potestate Nostra, consuleremus, praesertim cum horum temporum eruditio progrediens quaestionibus quotidie novis, aliquandoque etiam temerariis, aditum ianuamque patefaciat. Itaque universitatem catholicorum, maxime qui sacri essent ordinis, commonefecimus quae cuiusque pro facultate sua partes

in hac caussa forent; accurateque persequuti sumus qua ratione et via haec ipsa studia provehi congruenter temporibus oporteret. Neque in irritum huiusmodi documenta Nostra cecidere. Iucunda memoratu sunt quae subinde sacrorum Antistites aliique praestantes doctrina viri magno numero obsequii sui testimonia deferre ad Nos maturaverint; cum et earum rerum, quas perscripseramus, opportunitatem gravitatemque efferrent, et diligenter se mandata effecturos confirmarent. Nec minus grate ea recordamur, quae in hoc genere catholici homines re deinceps praestitere, excitata passim horum studiorum alacritate.—Verumtamen insidere vel potius ingravescere caussas videmus easdem, quamobrem eas Nos Litteras dandas censuimus. Necesse est igitur illa ipsa iam impensius urgeri praescripta: id quod Venerabilium Fratrum Episcoporum diligentiae etiam atque etiam volumus commendatum.

Sed quo facilius uberiusque res e sententia eveniat, novum quoddam auctoritatis Nostrae subsidium nunc addere decrevimus. Etenim cum divinos hodie explicare tuerique Libros, ut oportet, in tanta scientiae varietate tamque multiplici errorum forma, maius quiddam sit, quam ut id catholici interpretes recte efficere usquequaque possint singuli, expedit communia ipsorum adiuvari studia ac temperari auspicio ductuque Sedis Apostolicae. Id autem commode videmur posse consequi si, quo providentiae genere in aliis promovendis disciplinis usi sumus, eodem in hac, de qua sermo nunc est, utamur. His de caussis placet, certum quoddam Consilium sive, uti loquuntur, *Commissionem* gravium virorum institui: qui eam sibi habeant provinciam, omni ope curare et efficere, ut divina eloquia exquisitiorem illam, quam tempora postulant, tractationem passim apud nostros inveniant, et incolumia sint non modo a quovis errorum afflatu, sed etiam ab omni opinionum temeritate. Huius Consilii praecipuam sedem esse addecet Romae, sub ipsis oculis Pontificis maximi: ut quae Urbs magistra et custos est christianae sapientiae, ex eadem in universum christianae reipublicae corpus sana et incorrupta huius quoque tam necessariae doctrinae praeceptio influat. Viri autem ex quibus id Consilium coalescet, ut suo muneri, gravi in primis et honestissimo, cumulate satisfaciant, haec proprie habebunt suae navitati proposita.

Primum omnium probe perspecto qui sint in his disciplinis hodie ingeniorum cursus, nihil ducant instituto suo alienum, quod recentiorum industria repererit novi: quin imo excubent animo, si quid dies afferat utile in exegesim Biblicam, ut id sine mora assumant communemque in usum scribendo convertant. Quamobrem ii multum operae in excolenda philologia doctrinisque finitimis, earumque persequendis progressionibus collocent. Cum enim inde fere consueverit Scripturarum oppugnatio existere, inde etiam nobis quaerenda sunt arma, ne veritatis impar sit cum errore concertatio.—Similiter danda est opera, ut minori in pretio ne sit apud nos, quam apud externos, linguarum veterum orientalium scientia, aut codicum maxime primigeniorum peritia: magna enim in his studiis est utriusque opportunitas facultatis.

Deinde quod spectat ad Scripturarum auctoritatem integre asserendam, in eo quidem acrem curam diligentiamque adhibeant. Idque praesertim laborandum ipsis est, ut nequando inter catholicos invalescat illa sentiendi agendique ratio, sane non probanda, qua scilicet plus nimio tribuitur heterodoxorum sententiis perinde quasi germana Scripturae intelligentia ab externae eruditionis apparatu sit in primis quaerenda. Neque enim cuiquam catholico illa possunt esse dubia, quae fusius alias Ipsi revocavimus: Deum non privato doctorum iudicio permisisse Scripturas, sed magisterio Ecclesiae interpretandas tradidisse: "in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, eum pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendum esse, quem tenuit ac tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum; atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari";[1] eam esse divinorum naturam Librorum, ut ad religiosam illam, qua involvuntur, obscuritatem illustrandam subinde non valeant hermeneuticae leges, verum dux et magistra divinitus data opus sit, Ecclesia; demum legitimum divinae Scripturae sensum extra Ecclesiam neutiquam reperiri, neque ab eis tradi posse qui magisterium ipsius auctoritatemque repudiaverint.—Ergo viris qui de Consilio fuerint, curandum sedulo, ut horum diligentior quotidie sit custodia principiorum: adducanturque persuadendo, si qui forte heterodoxos admirantur

[1] Conc. Vatic. sess. III, cap. II, *De revel.*

praeter modum, ut magistram studiosius observent audiantque Ecclesiam. Quamquam usu quidem venit catholico interpreti, ut aliquid ex alienis auctoribus, maxime in re critica, capiat adiumenti: sed cautione opus ac delectu est. Artis criticae disciplinam, quippe percipiendae penitus hagiographorum sententiae, perutilem, Nobis vehementer probantibus, nostri excolant. Hanc ipsam facultatem, adhibita loco ope heterodoxorum, Nobis non repugnantibus iidem exacuant. Videant tamen ne ex hac consuetudine intemperantiam iudicii imbibant: siquidem in hanc saepe recidit artificium illud criticae, ut aiunt, sublimioris; cuius periculosam temeritatem plus semel Ipsi denuntiavimus.

Tertio loco, in eam studiorum horum partem quae proprie est de exponendis Scripturis, cum latissime fidelium utilitati pateat, singulares quasdam curas Consilium insumat. Ac de iis quidem testimoniis, quorum sensus aut per sacros auctores aut per Ecclesiam authentice declaratus sit, vix attinet dicere, convincendum esse, eam interpretationem solam ad sanae hermeneuticae leges posse probari. Sunt autem non pauca, de quibus cum nulla extiterit adhuc certa et definita expositio Ecclesiae, liceat privatis doctoribus eam, quam quisque probarit, sequi tuerique sententiam: quibus tamen in locis cognitum est analogiam fidei catholicamque doctrinam servari tamquam normam oportere. Iamvero in hoc genere magnopere providendum est, ut ne acrior disputandi contentio transgrediatur mutuae caritatis terminos; neve inter disputandum ipsae revelatae veritates divinaeque traditiones vocari in disceptationem videantur. Nisi enim salva consensione animorum collocatisque in tuto principiis, non licebit ex variis multorum studiis magnos expectare huius disciplinae progressus. — Quare hoc etiam in mandatis Consilio sit, praecipuas inter doctores catholicos rite et pro dignitate moderari quaestiones; ad easque finiendas qua lumen iudicii sui, qua pondus auctoritatis afferre. Atque hinc illud etiam consequetur commodi, ut maturitas offeratur Apostolicae Sedi declarandi quid a catholicis inviolate tenendum, quid investigationi altiori reservandum, quid singulorum iudicio relinquendum sit.

Quod igitur christianae veritati conservandae bene vertat, studiis Scripturae sanctae promovendis ad eas leges, quae supra statutae sunt, Consilium sive *Commissionem* in hac alma Urbe per

has litteras instituimus. Id autem Consilium constare volumus ex aliquot S. R. E. Cardinalibus auctoritate Nostra deligendis: iisque in communionem studiorum laborumque mens est adiungere cum Consultorum officio ac nomine, ut in sacris urbanis Consiliis mos est, claros nonnullos, alios ex alia gente, viros quorum a doctrina sacra, praesertim biblica, sit commendatio. Consilii autem erit et statis conventibus habendis, et scriptis vel in dies certos vel pro re data vulgandis, et si rogatum sententiam fuerit, respondendo consulentibus, denique omnibus modis, horum studiorum, quae dicta sunt, tuitioni et incremento prodesse. Quaecumque vero res consultae communiter fuerint, de iis rebus referri ad Summum Pontificem volumus; per illum autem ex Consultoribus referri, cui Pontifex ut sit ab actis Consilii mandaverit. — Atque ut communibus iuvandis laboribus supellex opportuna suppetat, iam nunc certam Bibliothecae Nostrae Vaticanae ei rei addicimus partem; ibique digerendam mox curabimus codicum voluminumque de re Biblica collectam ex omni aetate copiam, quae Consilii viris in promptu sit. In quorum instructum ornatumque praesidiorum valde optandum est locupletiore catholici Nobis suppetias veniant vel utilibus mittendis libris; atque ita peropportuno genere officii Deo, Scripturarum Auctori, itemque Ecclesiae navare operam velint.

Ceterum confidimus fore, ut his coeptis Nostris, utpote quae christianae fidei incolumitatem sempiternamque animarum salutem recta spectent, divina benignitas abunde faveat; eiusque munere, Apostolicae Sedis in hac re praescriptionibus catholici, qui sacris Litteris sunt dediti, cum absoluto numeris omnibus obsequio respondeant.

Quae vero in hac caussa statuere ac decernere visum est, ea omnia et singula uti statuta et decreta sunt, ita rata et firma esse ac manere volumus et iubemus; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub anulo Piscatoris die XXX Octobris anno MDCCCCII, Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo quinto.

A. Card. Macchi.

Conferences.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on the study of the Sacred Scripture, and the duties of the recently-appointed Pontifical Commission on Bible Study.

"CATHOLIC" AND "ROMAN CATHOLIC."

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

A critic of the article which appeared under the above title in a former number of the REVIEW[1] writes that it is confusing. Will he allow me to say in reply that the criticism is certainly *confused.* Indeed it gives rise to a suspicion that the critic did not condescend to read with much care what he somewhat contemptuously dismisses in his page and a half of animadversion. I say this because, as a matter of fact, he comes to the same practical conclusions as I do. I will mention points of agreement first, before going on to the objections which he raises. To begin with, he, like myself, holds the term *Catholic Church* to be a sufficient and, usually, the preferable way of designating the Church of Christ. At the same time he, like myself, holds that there are occasions when the use of the word *Roman* is not only appropriate, but obligatory. Secondly, he quotes with approval one of the speakers at the Council who calls the designation of the Church "an enumeration of the *notes* of the Church." A good part of my article was given up to developing this idea, and particularly to showing that the word *Romana* does implicitly express the note of unity, by desig-

[1] *Cf.* THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Sept., pp. 241–255; Nov., pp. 548–550.

nating its very root-principle. Thirdly, my critic contends that the Council did not adopt the term *Romana* as modifying the name of the Church. So do I. The word *Roman* does not modify the name (nor the "description") of the Church.[2] Lastly, my critic says there is no development of "Catholic" into "Roman Catholic," but that "if there is any development, it is that of the *unam* of Nice into *Romanam* of the Vatican." Here, too, if my critic wishes only to reject a mere verbal development, I am with him. I contended for the development, not of one *word* into another, but of a fuller and more complete designation of the Church from a designation less full, though containing in the idea which it represented all that has since been brought out more fully. Development is concerned with ideas and truths, not mere words. As to the development of the *unam* of Nice into the *Romanam* of the Vatican, I have already suggested it in showing that the word *Romana* does express the note of unity by designating its living principle. On the question of this development Father Perrone[2] writes as follows: "Jure quoad hanc denominationem *ecclesiae romanae* qua designatur *ecclesia catholica*, aptare debemus responsionem quam dedit S. Pacianus in ep. 1. ad Sympronianum, cum sibi ex persona Novatianorum objecisset: 'sed sub apostolis, inquies, nemo catholicus vocabatur: esto, respondet, sic fuerit, vel illud indulge. Cum post apostolos haereses extitissent: diversisque nominibus columbam Dei atque reginam lacerare per partes et scindere niterentur: nonne cognomen suum plebs apostolica postulabat, quo incorrupti populi distingueret unitatem, nec intemeratam Dei virginem error aliquorum per membra laceraret? *Nonne appellatione propria decuit caput principale signare?*' (Italics mine.) *Igitur ad eum modum quo prius ecclesia, quae christiana dicebatur, ob varietatem haereticorum et schismaticorum qui sibi hanc appellationem communem fecerunt, debuit vocari 'catholica' ut a sectis distingueretur, sic cum postea iidem haeretici et schismatici factiones suas coeperint vocari ecclesiam 'orthodoxam' et 'catholicam,' debuit praeterea denominari romana ab ejus capite romano Pontifice, ut internosceretur a factionibus illud sibi nomen usurpantibus.*"[3] What is this else than the development I have

[2] See the concluding words of the article in question, p. 255, beginning "Roman takes nothing away from 'Catholic,'" etc.

[3] *Theol. Dogm. De Loc. Theol.*, P. 1, Cap.III, §284, nota 2. Ed. Romae 1841.

indicated on p. 253 in these words: "Thus, just as the name 'Catholic' originated in the universal and early recognition of an essential note of the only religion which possessed true *Christianity*, so, too, the name 'Roman' has been adopted by the Church herself and recognized by the world at large as the proper appellation of the only religion which has any claim to true Catholicism." Here is a true development, not of mere words, but of the orginal idea of the Church as it was in the Mind of Her Divine Founder,—the Church which, under whatever name she went, was always Catholic and always Roman because of her essential notes of Catholicity and Unity—a Unity flowing from its centre, the Roman See. Despite his animadversions about development, I think I may say that my critic will agree with me so far. What then does he complain of? Apparently that I speak of the term *Roman* as part of the official name of the Church, and that I defend the use, in certain circumstances only, of the English expression "Roman Catholic." He wants me, instead of writing *name*, to write *description*. He prefers to say that "there is no question of the distinctive *name* of the Church," quoting one of the speakers at the Council. Another speaker, the Bishop of Brixen, who, as Relator of the *Deputatio de Fide*, bore a prominent part in the discussion upon the designation of the Church, thought otherwise. He spoke of the words "Romana Catholica Ecclesia" as the *proprium nomen Ecclesiae*, and gave this as the reason for the rejection of the proposal to insert a comma between *Romana* and *Catholica*. His argument prevailed so far that a majority of the Fathers voted for the omission of the comma. But supposing that, for the sake of argument, I admit this distinction—one, it seems to me, without a difference—between the *name* of the Church, and her authentic description, or, as Fr. Granderath puts it, the *designation* of the Church,[5] what does it profit my critic? My contention is simply that *Roman*, having been officially incorporated in the authentic description (if

[4] Italics mine. In view of my opponent's objection to calling *Romana* part of the *name* of the Church, I should like to draw attention to the use of the words "denominationem," "cognomen," "*appellatione propria*" and "denominari" in the whole of Fr. Perrone's note.

[5] Grand., Constit. Dogm. Vat. Conc., P. 1, Cap. alterum. Comment 1.

he likes) of the Church, no Catholic has any right to repudiate the term, the introduction of which, moreover, as he says himself, may be of obligation. This is the very point on which I wished to insist. His real difficulty would appear to be the relative position of the words *Roman* and *Catholic* in the customary English expression "the Roman Catholic Church." He is very much afraid of this expression, though quite needlessly, if he pays attention to the obvious distinction which I quoted from Fr. Perrone, between the use of the word "Roman" of the Universal Church, and its use of the particular Roman Church, *in alma Urbe*. His objection to the phrase, if he put it plainly, would, I suppose, run thus: The Council rejected the *order* of the words *Romana Catholica Ecclesia* (not, as he confusedly puts it, the *form* of words, which was retained in substance, though in a different order), therefore we must reject the *order* of the words *Roman Catholic Church*. Well and good. If my critic likes to say "Catholic Roman Church," by all means let him, but he will be very singular, and people will wonder what he is talking about. I am not sure that this is what he wants, for he does not express himself with any great clearness. He says "the Council rejected the form *Romana Catholica Ecclesia*, and it adopted the form *Romana Ecclesia*." As a matter of fact the Council adopted much more. It adopted the form "Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia." What, then, does my critic mean? Is this a misprint? Or is he quoting *Romana Ecclesia* alone, when he means to quote the whole designation? Or does he mean that while he objects to say Roman Catholic Church, he does not mind designating the whole Church as the "Roman Church"? It is very confusing. At any rate, he altogether confuses the issue by what I must describe as something of a quibble. The main question is not that of the order of the words, but of the rejection or retention of the word *Romana*. We must take facts as they are. The custom of saying Roman Catholic Church is universal amongst English-speaking Catholics *on those occasions which call for the term "Roman,"* and the phrase is almost always used, and with pride, by Irish Catholics. This custom has never, so far as I am aware, been adversely commented upon by authority. Would not my critic, if he found himself under the necessity of using *Roman*,

say, like any one else, *Roman Catholic?* He insinuates that I contradict myself in that my article "begins by showing that the Vatican Council rejected the form of words *Romana Catholica Ecclesia*, and ends by maintaining that we are not at liberty to reject the form of words *The Roman Catholic Church.*" Had I said the Council rejects the *order* of the words *Romana Catholica Ecclesia;* we are not to reject the *order* of the words *Roman Catholic Church*, I might perhaps more justly have been accused of a contradiction, though I should not then have pleaded guilty, seeing that the order of words in Latin is one thing, and in English another, owing to the difference of idiom in the languages. But my contention is quite another, namely, that the Council insisted upon the retention of the word "Romana," in the face of considerable opposition, and that *we*, therefore, must not repudiate the word *Roman.* That in English we place "Roman" before "Catholic" is an accidental circumstance, due to the idiom of the language, and has nothing whatever to do with my argument. As to my critic's comparison of the term "Roman" as applied to the Church Catholic with the words "wealthy" or "democratic" as applied to the United States of America, the obvious reply is *nulla paritas.* Neither "wealthy" nor "democratic" enters into the designation of any country as expressing an essential note or constituent element of the country. On the other hand, *Roman* does enter into the designation of the Church as expressing something essential to her very being, namely communion with the centre of Unity. In a word, I fail entirely to see the force or necessity of my critic's subtle distinction between a "name" and a "full description." After all, what are the Church's names for except to describe her fully? I am really curious to know how my opponent would so use the term Roman in speaking of the Church as to make it clear that he was using it, not as a "name," but as a "description." If he must insist upon this point he ought surely to go back further than he has. "The name of the Church," he says, "has always been nothing but *the Catholic Church.*" But was the name of the Church *always* "the Catholic Church"? Certainly not. Was not "Catholic" added and made part and parcel of the name of the Church, by a true development of the idea contained in the Church from the beginning? If we look for *Catholic* in Holy Scripture we shall not

find it. The Catholic Church, as Fr. Perrone shows in the note I have quoted above, was first called "the Christian Church" or the "Church of Christ," and its members "Christians." My critic admits that the addition *Catholic* became part of the Church's name. On his own showing he must admit the same about the addition *Roman*, which was made for precisely similar reasons. On his own principles my critic must either allow that both "Roman" and "Catholic" are *names*, or deny it of both. If "Roman" is not part of the name of the Church, neither is "Catholic." But, after all, why all this bother about the distinction between a "name" and a "full description," or, as the authorities I have quoted call it, a "designation," or an "appellation," or a "denomination"? But, lest my critic should find that it has taken a "fifteen-page article" to assure him that he is making a mountain out of a mole-hill, I will conclude by pointing out one more confusion, exhibited in his closing sentence. "The name of the Church," he says, "is the Catholic Church. The descriptive words 'One,' 'Holy,' 'Apostolic,' 'Roman,' 'Visible,' 'Infallible,' etc., are properly used when, and only when, occasion calls for them." Apart from the fact that my critic again in this sentence quite forgets that I myself, as much as he, would keep to the simple term "Catholic Church" except on certain occasions,—occasions, that is, similar to those which first caused the addition of the term *Roman* to be made,—I would point out that there is no authority for this supposed difference between the term "Catholic" and the terms "One," "Holy," "Apostolic," and "Roman." These are no more *merely* descriptive than "Catholic." What "Catholic" is, *they* are, whether we speak of them as "names" or "descriptions." I should prefer to call them "descriptive names," for the names of the Church do certainly describe her. "Catholic" describes her just as much as "One" or "Roman." As for "Visible" and "Infallible," should circumstances arise to make those words *tesserae* by which the Church should be distinguished from some form of error, doubtless they would be so used, but this is not likely, since, as I showed in my article, the great essential notes of the Church, which include practically everything by which she is distinguishable from false religious bodies, are already admirably expressed in her authentic name of "Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, *Roman* Church."

H. G. HUGHES.

IS THE BAPTISM OF THE CAMPBELLITES VALID?

The question has been put to us whether the Catholic Church recognizes as valid the baptism administered by a minister of the "Disciples of Christ," commonly called "Campbellites." The form used by that sect is practically the same as the one used by Catholics, and the person over whom it is pronounced is immediately after immersed in the water. The doubt arises partly from the fact that the words and the immersion are not simultaneous, and might, therefore, *not* be considered as *one act*, in which the words should simply express the meaning of the act. The question seems important, because it raises another regarding the validity of a marriage between a Catholic and a Campbellite. That marriage would be invalid, if the Campbellite is not regarded as validly baptized; it would be valid if his baptism is recognized. In both cases a dispensation would indeed be required; but from two very different impediments. If the pastor sends a Catholic wishing to enter marriage with a Campbellite to the bishop for a dispensation, and the latter grant it on the supposition that both parties are baptized, and only differ in the recognition of an external worship, would that dispensation hold good if the Campbellite rite is really invalid? In such a case it seems a different dispensation would have to be obtained.

To make the full import of the above question clear, I premise, before answering directly, some general remarks bearing on the subject.

It is the accepted law and practice of the Church to consider the baptism of water conferred in the form prescribed by Christ as valid, no matter what the belief or morals of the person who administers the rite, provided such person intends to do what the Church prescribes. Hence baptism rightly administered by a heretic or an infidel is to be held valid; so much so that if there be no room for doubt about the integrity of the ceremony performed, the Church does not even permit the rite to be repeated by a priest, and this under pain of censure.

If, on the other hand, there be some doubt that the ceremony of baptism administered by any person other than the priest was essentially faulty or defective, so that the words (form) employed were not really the same as those prescribed by our Lord; or if it

be doubtful that the material used was real natural water; or, lastly, if the manner in which the water and the words were applied indicated that there was no intended or real connection between them, or that the person did not mean to do what the Church prescribes, then—in all such cases—the baptism is not regarded as valid, and must be repeated.

It is to be presumed that adult persons who, having a doubt, wish to make sure of their having received the sacramental rite of baptism (since it involves their explicit title to participation in the grace of salvation), wish also to be governed by the laws of the Christian Church. Hence, when there is question of certain engagements entered upon by them under the assumption that they were baptized (and therefore members of Christ's visible Church), such engagements or obligations may be justly held to bind them. Marriages, therefore, contracted by parties baptized—even if their baptism is afterwards proved of doubtful validity—are held by the Church to be valid.[1]

The baptism administered by orthodox Lutherans who maintain the Augsburg confession, or by Episcopalians who follow the Catholic Ritual, or by Baptists who believe in the necessity of the regeneration by means of baptism as established by Christ, is presumably valid; and though converts from any of these sects are in most cases conditionally rebaptized because the evidence of validity in individual instances is wanting, it is usually assumed as sufficient proof in favor of the validity of a subsequent marriage

[1] Thus the marriage of a Catholic to a baptized Protestant is considered *valid* in the Church; and the single obstacle which she places in the way of making it a *licit* marriage arises from a decided difference of Christian profession of faith on the part of two persons who ought to be of one mind on so serious a subject. Even if the Church did not give her consent to such a marriage, it would be considered valid by her ecclesiastical tribunal. In such cases a dispensation is given to safeguard the Catholic party against complete separation from the Church. The impediment calling for this dispensation (termed *mixed religion*) is granted only under the condition that the Catholic party retain full right to the exercise of his or her religion, that the children be raised in the true faith, and that every legitimate effort be made, by example, etc., to bring the non-Catholic party to an understanding and appreciation of the Catholic faith.

But a marriage between a Catholic and an unbaptized person is regarded by the Church (to whom the Catholic party professes allegiance) as invalid. If for serious reasons she dispenses from the impediment which (termed *disparity of cult*) ordinarily annuls such a marriage, it becomes valid.

between Christians thus baptized. After these preliminaries, which will help to clear the understanding of the Catholic position, I return to the question:

1. Can the baptism of the Campbellites (Disciples of Christ) be regarded in the same light as the baptism of Lutherans, Episcopalians, and Baptists, so that a marriage between a Catholic and a Campbellite contracted without dispensation is to be considered valid?

2. Does the dispensation from the impediment of *mixed religion* which renders such marriages simply *illicit*, apply to the case of Campbellites, or must the dispensation be from the diriment or annulling impediment of *disparity?*

I answer—that the baptism of the Campbellite sect is not Christian baptism, and hence the union between a professed member of that sect and a Catholic is invalid. It requires a dispensation from the impediment of disparity. It is quite true

THE BAPTISM OF THE "DISCIPLES OF CHRIST" OR CAMPBELLITES

is similar or entirely alike to that of the Baptists, which is usually held to be valid by the Catholic authorities. The words are the same as were used in the Christian Church of old, and the manner is by the ancient mode of immersion. The form (words) is pronounced immediately before the act of ablution by immersion, and though there are theologians who call the validity of the act in question because the *words* are not *simultaneous* with the *act* of baptizing, common sense recognizes the fact that the words "I baptize thee," directly refer to the act of immersion which immediately follows.

But the essential requisite which would stamp the action of a Campbellite preacher as Christian baptism in the sense understood and demanded by the Church is still wanting. That requisite is a proper intention. The followers of Thomas, Alexander, and John Campbell, whilst retaining the outward ceremonial derived from their previous allegiance with the sect of the Baptists, distinctly repudiate belief in the Sacrament of Regeneration. They hold the rite of baptism in water to be a symbolic expression of penance, namely, "the burial in water of the penitent believer

who has died to sin." They formally protest against its having the meaning and virtue of cleansing the soul from original and actual sin. Hence their action, although it has the semblance of Christian baptism, is quite as different from it as would be the action of a player performing the function on the stage *without any intention of fulfilling the prescription of the Church.*

It may be objected that the faith or belief of the person baptizing does not affect the validity of the baptism; for the Church permits infidels and heretics to baptize, and she recognizes, as has been said, their baptism as valid provided the proper form of words and the actual ablution be observed.

This is true provided the infidel or heretic baptizing intends to do *what the Church prescribes or intends.* To have this intention he need not personally believe in the efficacy of the act, nay, he might believe the very contrary. If an infidel physician baptizing the child of a Christian mother in danger of death, said: "I mean to do what the mother of the child, or what the Roman Church intends by this act," he would baptize validly, although he might still say to himself: "I don't think this ceremony is of any use to the soul, and I would not have my own child thus baptized."

If, on the other hand, he performed the act, saying to himself: "I intend simply *to wash* this child clean, but since it belongs to a Christian mother I will use the form of the cross and the words: 'I wash (or baptize) thee in the name of the Father,' etc.," he would not baptize the child validly because he did not intend to do so, whatever his belief might be.

Herein, I think, the theologians err who hold that practically we are to accept as valid all baptisms in which form and matter are rightly observed, taking no account whatever of the intention. It is true, indeed, that if a Campbellite were acting for a Catholic, for example a nurse baptizing the dying child of a Catholic mother whom she attends, and wishing simply to fulfil the mother's intention, she may be supposed to have baptized the child validly. Yet in such a case the assumption of validity arises not from the fact merely that she used the right form and matter, but because she acted presumably in the intention of the mother who wished the child baptized in the rite of her own Church. Apart

from such circumstances, however, the baptism administered in the Campbellite rite and intention is no baptism in the Christian sense. For the Campbellite intends distinctly a different rite, a sort of baptism of penance. Hence it follows that when there is question of dispensation in reference to matrimony the impediment to be removed is that of *disparity* and not merely of *mixed religion.*

THE PROPER STIPEND FOR A MISSION.

To the Editor of THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

DEAR SIR.—I am thinking of asking two first-class missionaries belonging to a religious order to conduct a two weeks' mission in my parish which numbers about four hundred families. I desire to know what would be a just stipend for the work of the missionaries if well done.

Respectfully yours,

IUSTUS.

The above letter for reply was handed to an "order" missionary of much experience in the United States. The answer is here given:

Reverend and Dear Editor:

For want of more detailed circumstances it is impossible to make a direct reply to the query of Iustus. There are parishes and parishes.

1. Where the parish is extremely poor, and the pastor deems a mission necessary, the proper thing for him to do is to ask the missionaries to give his people a mission for the pure love of God.

2. Where the parish is poor but able to pay for what it receives, the pastor might offer to give the missionaries what they can get from the Sunday evening collections announced; or ask them at the time of engagement to be satisfied with a particular stipend mentioned.

3. Where the parish is not poor, the pastor ought to be satisfied with taking for the church all the week-day and Sunday Mass collections, and the fifty per cent. he receives from stores in the sale of mission goods. He should then give the people a chance of showing their gratitude to the missionaries for the exhausting work done; and, for this purpose, he himself, or the missionaries at his request, should announce a special collection to be taken up at the closing exercises of

each week for the missionaries. This becomes their stipend ; and whether it be more or less, it should be given to them in full. When a pastor seizes upon any part of this it should be to him not only a matter of confusion but of confession. If before making arrangements for the mission he grow fearful lest the people be too generous to the missionaries, then let him offer to give a stipend of not less than one hundred dollars per week to each first-class missionary employed. To offer less is to act niggardly. This stipend of one hundred dollars per week for each man is extremely moderate when one considers the great outlay of money which the religious orders spend in preparing a man for this work ; the short time a man can be employed in so exhausting a labor ; the time spent in recuperating after each mission ; to say nothing of personal and travelling expenses. The religious missionaries, as far as I know, are not out for making money for themselves, much less do they wish to do it for others. They do heroic work in the field, and the spiritual fruit is beyond estimate ; but being but men they rejoice when gratitude is shown, and when unjustly treated depart too often with the farewell " God bless you !" sticking in the throat.

Kindly yours,

HONESTUS.

FROM MY CHRISTIAN ART PORTFOLIO.

The Epiphany in Art.—When we reflect on the pictorial possibilities of the arrival of the so-called Kings of the East in all their Oriental splendor, trappings and the picturesque feature of Moorish princes we need not be surprised that the greatest painters, and notably the greatest colorists, have made the Epiphany the frequent subject of their work.

In the Cathedral of Cologne, we admire the " Dom Bild " of Stephen Loethenec. In the Pinacothek of Munich hangs Roger Van der Weyden's noble painting. In the Hospital of St. John, Bruges, Belgium, thousands visit yearly the masterpiece of Hans Memlinc.

The call of both Jews and Gentiles is often represented by triptychs : the Birth of Christ in the central panel, the visit of the Shepherds and the Adoration of the Magi being represented on the side panels.

In old paintings the Child *blesses;* only modern painters have made him fumble in the gold offering. The Blessed Mother always *sits;* Rubens was the first to make her stand; his disciples followed suit.

Rubens painted the "Three Kings," fifteen times. The best of these are: one in London, the other in the Prado Museum at Madrid.

On the walls of a church in Florence are the noted frescoes of Taddeo Gaddi and Benozzo Gozzoli.

The Tanners' Guild of Bruges, Belgium, ordered a painting of the Three Kings for their Guild Chapel in the Church of Notre Dame. Hans Memlinc painted it for them in 1480. It is now in the Munich gallery.

MASS ON THE ALTAR OF EXPOSITION DURING THE FORTY HOURS.

Qu. Would you kindly settle a doubt recently discussed by some of my neighbors as to whether or not we may say the regular morning Masses at the altar of Exposition during the Forty Hours' Adoration?

Resp. The custom of saying Masses on the altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed for public adoration is forbidden, unless there is a necessity, or a grave reason, or a special dispensation. The same holds good for the distribution of Holy Communion, when the Blessed Sacrament can be preserved in the tabernacle of any other altar.

Quid sentiendum de usu in dies semper invalescente celebrandi Missas coram SSo. Sacramento publice exposito in Ecclesiis, in quibus non desunt alia altaria, item et distribuendi S. Communionem in iisdem Missis et extra Missas in eodem altari?

Ad I. *Non licere sine necessitate, vel gravi causa, vel ex speciali indulto.*

Ad II. *Negative.* Ex resp. S. R. C., die 11 Maii 1878.

(*Decreta auth.*, ad I, 5728.)

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. The Pontifical Commission on Bible Study.—For nearly a year we have heard and read much about a committee of Cardinals and Biblical scholars which was to be formed by the authority of our Holy Father, in order to advance and direct Catholic Bible study. The names of its members were made public and duly commented upon; its object and its probable course of action formed fertile topics of conjecture. But it was not till October 30, 1902, that His Holiness issued the letter by which the Commission was formally established. After referring to the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, issued in 1893, and its deep and lasting influence on the whole Catholic world, the Holy Father declares his intention to further Catholic Bible study in a new way by establishing a Commission of grave men, whose seat is to be in Rome, whose members are to be chosen from the body of Cardinals and from eminent scholars of various nationalities, whose purpose is to bring Catholic Bible study up to date, and to protect it from erroneous and rash opinions. The special directions laid down by His Holiness for the guidance of the Commission are few and simple: (1) Every new line of thought and every discovery bearing on Biblical exegesis are to be utilized immediately, especial emphasis being laid on philology and the study of Oriental languages. (2) Though the Church is the interpreter of Sacred Scripture according to the teaching of the Vatican Council, and consequently too much attention must not be paid to the opinions and the erudition of non-Catholic writers, still their writings should be utilized when they contain anything really helpful, and the art of modern criticism should be cultivated. (3) While the interpretation of Biblical passages authentically explained by Sacred Scripture itself or by the Church is no longer free to the Catholic commentator, the explanation of all the other passages offers a wide field of free investigation; but here, too, the Catholic student must be guided by

the analogy of faith, and must not offend against the law of charity. As to its business side, the Commission is to have its regular meetings, is to issue its publications either periodically or as occasion may demand, is to answer the questions of those asking advice, and must, through its secretary, refer to the Holy Father whatever has been subject of common consultation. Finally, in the Vatican Library a special department is to be devoted to Biblical literature, ancient and modern, and for this purpose donations of this kind of books are solicited.

2. Assyriology and the Bible.—The relation of Assyriology to the Bible, as far as it could be known up to within a few years ago, has been clearly and quite satisfactorily set forth by F. Vigouroux, A. H. Sayce, and the Rev. John Urquhart. But during the last few years available Assyriological documents have been so considerably multiplied, and certain points of contact between the Bible and Assyriology have been so emphatically asserted on the one side and so absolutely denied on the other, that a few words on the subject may prove of interest to the reader. Father Condamin[1] estimates the number of Assyrian inscriptions that are now in European or American libraries at 160,000; at the same time he assures us, on the authority of M. Pognon, who has held the office of Consul at Bagdad for many years, that as yet not one-millionth part of the ancient ruins has been removed from the plains between the Euphrates and the Tigris. It is believed that about one-half of the inscriptions thus far found are in the possession of the British Museum; some 20,000 of these belong to the library of Assurbanipal. According to *The Commercial Advertiser*,[2] Professor Hermann V. Hilprecht, of Philadelphia, who returned a few months ago from excavating the buried cities of Nippur, possesses some 23,000 tablets that await deciphering. Our living Assyriologists may amount to sixty or seventy, so that they have an abundance of work in hand. In fact, they have found it best to become specialists within their own specialty; one devotes himself to history, another to contract tablets, a third to letters and despatches, a fourth to religious texts, another again to texts bearing on cosmology and astronomy.

[1] *Études*, November 20, 1902, La Bible et L'Assyriologie, premier article.

[2] New York, October 6, 1902.

Thus if we look through the series of popular monographs on Babylonian and Assyrian topics, entitled *Der Alte Orient*, we find that H. Zimmern has contributed a treatise on the primeval history of Babylonia as compared with that of the Bible,[3] H. Winckler has written a pamphlet on the Babylonian view of heaven and earth as the basis of the cosmology and the mythology of all nations,[4] and another on the political development of Assyria and Babylonia,[5] A. Jeremias has contributed a study on "The Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Hell,"[6] Dr. F. von Œfele has written on the system of medicine contained in the cuneiform literature.[7] This last subject has been more scientifically treated by Dr. Fr. Küchler, a pupil of Professor Jensen. The first part of his work[8] contains the transliteration and philological explanation of a number of texts belonging to the well-known series "Enuma Amêlu Sualam maris" (If a man suffers from . . .). The technical terms are in most cases quite satisfactorily explained, and the texts appear to bear that semi-religious character which we naturally expect in them. The whole work will appear as one of the volumes of the *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*. Dr. Küchler is more guarded in his general conclusion than Dr. von Œfele; according to the latter the whole of Eastern medicine is to be traced back to a common system, a development of one branch of which may be seen in the *corpus* of Hippocrates. This theory, however, may have to be altered after the publication of other Babylonian medical texts, hundreds of which are preserved in the Kouyunjik collections of the British Museum. Dr. Hermann Ranke writes a thesis on the proper names of persons in the cuneiform documents of the time of Hammurabi, the well-known contemporary of Abraham. He distinguishes the proper names as theophore or non-theophore, and as hypokoristics with or without suffixes; in a second part of his work the author promises to give a *list* of proper names of per-

[3] Biblische und Babylonische Urgeschichte, *Der Alte Orient*, ii, 3.

[4] Himmels- und Weltenbild der Babylonier, als Grundlage der Weltanschauung und Mythologie aller Völker, *Der Alte Orient*, iii, 2, 3.

[5] Politische Entwickelung Babyloniens und Assyriens, *Der Alte Orient*, ii, 1.

[6] Hölle und Paradies bei den Babyloniern, *Der Alte Orient*, i, 3.

[7] Keilschriftmedizin, *Der Alte Orient*, iv, 2, Leipzig, 1902.

[8] Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Assyrischen Medicin.

sons. Prof. Lehmann's *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*[9] continues Dr. Ginzel's paper on the *Astronomy of the Babylonians*, dealing especially with the sexagesimal system of reckoning; the author thus touches upon a question which has been discussed by Dr. Winckler in his pamphlet on "The Babylonian Conception of Heaven and Earth."[10] For this latter writer not merely describes the astral character of the Babylonian mythology, but also discusses the development of the sexagesimal system of reckoning, and the division of the year. The *Comptes rendus* of the Paris Academy contain a contribution by M. Thureau-Dangin in which are summarized the results of the excavations carried on by the late M. de Sarzec at Telloh. The new finds are important for the chronological position of a number of Old Babylonian rulers or kings, whose inscriptions are added in transliteration. The same scholar has undertaken a translation of the long cylinder-inscription *A* of Gudea, the first instalment of which is published in the current number of the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*. The *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie*[11] contains a new sequel of Father Scheil's notes; it gives a commercial document from Elam written in the Babylonian character and language. The same volume continues also Mr. Fr. Martin's miscellaneous Assyriological notes, in which an oracle of the god Marduk,[12] and a prayer to the same deity[13] are translated and published for the first time. In the last number of the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*,[14] Prof. Kohler, of Berlin, continues the researches begun some ten years ago in his well-known work "Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben;" Dr. G. Nagel studies some of Hammurabi's letters to Sinidinnam; Cornelis van Geldern explains a number of Babylonian and Assyrian letters from the library at Kouyunjik; Fred. Hrozny contributes a paper on money among the Babylonians; Dr. Edw. Kotalla explains fifty commercial documents of the time of Artaxerxes I.

What has been said sufficiently shows the increase of Babylo-

[9] Vol. i, part 3.
[10] *Der Alte Orient*, iii, 2, 3.
[11] Vol. xxiv.
[12] K. 3353 of the British Museum.
[13] K. 2403.
[14] Vol. iv, part 4.

nian literature during the last few months; but to render this fact still more striking, we may add the provisional conclusions of Prof. Hermann V. Hilprecht, the well known excavator of the buried cities of Nippur.[14] It appears certain that Nippur is a collection of sixteen cities, one built above the other; the lower ones of these have not as yet been reached. The place was not merely a temple, but a school and a college as well; its library is therefore an epitome of Babylonian civilization. The ancient Babylonians appear to have been underrated especially with regard to their astronomical, their mathematical, and their linguistic proficiency. On one tablet there are minute astronomical calculations as to the constellation of Scorpion, and the places and movements of the stars are so accurately described that the astronomers of that time must in some respects have been as proficient as those of to-day. Again, our multiplication tables stop at twelve, but the Babylonian tables go as far as sixty. The scientific workers of those days had the desire and the means of obtaining swift and large conclusions in numbers; their system of extended tables, particularly in astronomy, where the results of 1300 by 1300 are seen, is a veritable mathematical marvel. Once more, the Babylonian children, even in the schools of the lower grade, were compelled to master two languages—the one a learned, the other a colloquial tongue.

It has become the fashion of late to study Hebrew history as an integral part of the history of the large Semitic world. The reader has read of the works of McCurdy, and Rogers, and Jastrow; the last named work is now being published in a German translation.[15] But these publications are beyond the reach of the ordinary Bible student. Hence Ross G. Murison [16] has written a manual on the same subjects, intended to meet the needs of the common Bible reader. After briefly giving the political history in the first seventy-three pages, the author devotes the remainder of the book to the following topics: (1) Genesis according to the Monuments; (2) Religion; (3) Writing and

[14] Cf. *The Commercial Advertiser*, N. Y., October 6th.

[15] *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens.* Giessen: J. Ricker, 1902.

[16] *Babylonia and Assyria.* A Sketch of their History. New York. Imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons; pp. 115.

Literature; (4) Civilization. The author certainly writes clearly and concisely; but his very brevity does not permit him to represent his views according to their proper degree of probability. Catholic readers will find a handy manual in which the Babylonian discoveries have been properly applied to Biblical subjects in Dr. Æ. Schöpfer's History of the Old Testament.[17] At its first appearance this work met a certain amount of opposition; but at present its principles appear to have been recognized as solid and true. There exists a French translation of this work, edited by Pelt, which is quite favorably noticed in the above mentioned article contributed by Father Condamin to the *Études*. The same article shows what light Assyriology has thrown on the Biblical language and history. The Rev. author promises to treat in future articles on the relation of Assyriology to the Biblical religion and to the current creation and deluge traditions.

It cannot be denied that the light of Assyriology has affected the views of even Catholic interpreters of Biblical chronology. Towards the end of the eighteenth century several commentators pretended to know the very date and year of the creation of the world; why, it happened on the twenty-third day of October, 4004 B. C. It is rather shocking to find in the above History of the Old Testament, edited by Schöpfer-Pelt, a chronological table which sets down the dates of the creation, of the first appearance of man, and of the flood as unknown. On the other hand, certain higher critics had gone too far in deriving Biblical data from Assyriological sources. At the recent *Thirteenth International Congress of Orientalists*, held at Hamburg,[18] Prof. Merx, of Heidelberg, delivered an address on "The Influence of the Old Testament on the Development of Universal History," in which he pronounces it a mistake to insist, as it is now currently claimed, that the Elohist in the composition of the Pentateuch drew his system from the Babylonians. On the one hand, the real religious system of the Babylonians is not to be drawn from the cuneiform inscriptions, but from Berosus; on the other, the borrowing of materials from the one or from the other does not imply a corresponding dependence for the real religious views.

[17] *Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, 3 ed., Brixen 1902, 8vo, pp. xii+596.

[18] Sept. 4—Sept. 10, 1902.

For more important than the materials used by the various writers is the spirit in which they utilized this material, and in this respect the Elohist of the Old Testament is entirely independent of the Babylonians. These latter were materialists and evolutionists, while the Elohist is a creationist; the Babylonians considered their gods as later products, while the Elohist acknowledges a thinking Divine Spirit as the beginning of all things. Besides, the Biblical chronology is quite different from the Babylonian. While Prof. Merx thus established the independence of the Elohist, Prof. Bezold discussed the Assyrian transcription of the Hebrew names of God, and insisted that the expression Jahve-ilu should be rendered "God exists" or "There is a God." Prof. Delitzsch translated the phrase "Jehovah is God," and based upon this rendering his hypothesis that the Jews learned their Jehovah worship from their Babylonian neighbors. He has received a formal reply in a pamphlet, "*Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das Alte Testament*," published by Prof. Hommel, of Munich. This latter writer shows that the new theory is built upon a poor foundation, philologically and otherwise, and that the whole Wellhausen scheme misrepresents the true story of the Pentateuch. Among other defenders of the traditional view, W. Knieschke has made himself especially conspicuous by his pamphlet, *Bibel und Babel: El und Bel*, in which he shows from the opening chapters of Genesis that the Hebrews could not have borrowed their religious system from the Babylonians.

3. **Excavations in Palestine.**—In the *Quarterly Statement*, July to September, of the Palestine Exploration Fund, Dr. Schumacher gives a report of recent discoveries near Galilee. The writer belongs to Professor Sellin's party of excavators, consisting of four or five Europeans, an Austrian Imperial Commissioner, and from seventy to a hundred and fifty workmen and women. They conducted excavations on the site of the ancient city of Taanach, which is now Tell Ta'annek. The tell rises 120 to 140 feet above the surrounding plain, and on its summit there is a large pear-shaped plateau of 1,050 feet by 450, its highest point being nearly 800 feet above the sea. From this plateau down to the rock four large trenches were cut, in one place 36 feet deep. Much pottery

was discovered, belonging to all ages, except that of Rome. The remains are Phœnician, Jewish, Amorite, and even pre-Amorite. Jewish jars were discovered among the pottery, containing the ashes of young children, but no trace of adult remains. There must have been an ancient Jewish children's cemetery on the spot; near it was laid bare a rock altar, with a rock-cut step, dishes for offerings, and channels for carrying away the blood.

In the same issue of the *Statement*, Sir Charles Wilson gives an account of the excavations that have recently been made by Dr. Bliss and Mr. McAlister on behalf of the fund itself. Four sites have already been investigated. The first is *Tell Zakarîva*, above the Vale of Elah, from which one has a striking view of the battlefield in which "David slew Goliah." Here a town was laid bare of which no name has survived. But the remains show that it was founded in the late pre-Israelite period, perhaps about 1500 B. C., that it was fortified in Jewish times, perhaps by the successor of King Solomon, that it was occupied in the Seleucid period, and that it was deserted after a short Roman and Byzantine occupation. Dr. Bliss provisionally identifies it with Azekah or Socoh. Dr. Bliss then describes the work on the site of *Tell-es-Sâfi*, which stands at the mouth of the Vale of Elah, and may be the ancient Gath. Since a modern village and a cemetery occupy most of the summit, the area of excavation was rather limited. Still, enough was done to prove that there existed a city in the early pre-Israelite period, probably about 1700 B. C., which must have continued down to the days of the Seleucids. Next, we come to *Tell ej-Judeideh*, which lies south of *Tell Zakarîya*. The city on this site, no clue of whose name has been discovered, must have been founded in the early pre-Israelitic period, abandoned long before the Hebrew conquest, reoccupied during the Jewish monarchy, and fortified in Roman times. A Roman villa occupied the centre of the mound. The fourth site is *Tell Sandahannah*, which lies about a mile south of Beit Jibrin. Almost all the remains are of the Seleucid period, but the Seleucid town was built on the ruins of a Jewish city "which is almost certainly the Biblical Mareshah." A small suburb, about three-quarters of a mile distant, still retains the name in its modernized form *Khurbet Mer'ash*. The town was plundered by Judas

Machabæus, taken by John Hyrcanus, restored to the Idumæans by Pompey, and finally destroyed by the Parthians in 40 B. C. The site yielded much pottery and many limestone inscriptions. Most of the latter are ancient imprecations; but one bears the name of Berenike, possibly the mother of Ptolemy IV; another was found on the base of a statue of a queen Arsinoë, identified by Clermont-Ganneau with the sister and wife of Ptolemy IV, a lady who played an important part in the battle of Raphia. The site next to be attacked is Gezer, and it is the most promising of all. It stands a little to the south of the carriage road from Jaffa to Jerusalem, and a little to the north from the railway. Though it is frequently mentioned in the *Tell Amarna Tablets*, its name occurs in the Bible only at Jos. 10: 33; but it was not conquered by the Hebrews at that early period. When the cities were assigned to the Levites, Gezer was given to the Kohathites. After this, the town is not mentioned till about the time of David; it is not quite clear whether it was taken by this great warrior, but it was certainly taken a short time after by Pharaoh, who burned it, and gave it for a present to his daughter, the wife of Solomon. Not to follow up the later history of the town, we only draw attention to the fact, that if, during the course of excavation the ashes of a burned city are found at the very spot where they ought to be situated, archæology will furnish another instance in which it confirms the data of Biblical chronology.

Thus far we have reviewed the results of the Austrian and the English excavations in Palestine. The first director of the *American Institute* in Jerusalem, Prof. Torrey, has conducted some excavations at Sidon; similarly, a Russian delegation has been engaged in limited researches in Syria, especially about Palmyra.[19] But neither of these efforts appears to have thus far produced any remarkable results.

For a number of years the *Deutsche Palästina Verein* had devoted all the efforts to topographical studies in Palestine. But at the instigation and under the auspices of Emperor William, it has now again procured a firman from the Turkish government allowing excavations to be made at *Tell Moutesellim*, supposed to be the ancient Megiddo. A rich harvest of archæological results

[19] Compt. rend. Acad. Enscript. et Bel.-Lett., April, 1902, p. 100.

is therefore expected in the near future. It may be of interest to the reader to recall here the fact that the visit of Emperor William to Ba'albek, during the month of November, 1898, was the beginning of German excavations among the ruins of that ancient and interesting city. A month after the imperial visit the architect, Dr. R. Koldewey, drew a map of the extant ruins and proposed a scheme of excavations. These were begun on August 8, 1900, under the direction of Prof. O. Puchstein, by the architects, B. Schulz and D. Krencker; Dr. Sobernheim was placed in charge of the inscriptions. The expenses are paid partly by the German government, and partly, it is said, by the Emperor. The full results will not be known till the work of excavation is completed; but conclusions important enough to justify the expenditure of time and labor were published last year.[20] Finally, we may add here a notice of Prof. Grotemeyer's studies in which he compares the data given in the visions of A. K. Emmerich, with the corresponding historical and geographical facts of the Bible.[21] Thus far two fascicles of these curious studies have been published. The last contribution touches upon three subjects: Gideon's victory over Madian, Capharnaum and its surroundings, and the war between the Arabian prince Aretas and Herod Antipas. Whatever we may think of the so-called visions of A. K. Emmerich, their agreement with the facts of the Bible is certainly a subject of wonder. The writer shows that in the case of the victory over Madian especially, the writings of the simple nun solve a topographical problem that has puzzled a number of the most learned and critical commentators.

PHILOSOPHY.

The Philosophical Viewpoint of Evolutionism.—Canon Didiot in his recent *Contribution Philosophique à l'Étude des Sciences*[1] has briefly indicated the point of view from which Philosophy and Biology respectively consider the problem of organic evolution.

[20] Jahrb. d. k. deutsch. Arch. Inst., 133 ff., 1901.

[21] Studien zu den Visionen der gottseligen Augustinernonne A. K. Emmerich. Münster, 1902, Aschendorff.

[1] Lille: Desclèe, 1902.

The philosopher, he says, inquires whether the mineral has ever become a plant, a plant an animal, an animal a man. Having determined by observation and the physical sciences the characteristics of each of these three so-called kingdoms of nature, the philosopher infers that they differ from one another essentially, and that no member of a lower kingdom can in virtue of its inherent forces transcend its specific limitations and take its place in a higher kingdom; that therefore if the transition has ever been made from the mineral to the plant, or from the plant to the animal, it must have been effected by some extraneous cause; and that if ever a mere animal has passed to a place in the human kingdom, it must have been elevated by the special and immediate act of the Creator.

The philosopher therefore draws the lines of evolution at the kingdoms of nature. These are for him *fixed species.* Whether within each of those species there ever occurs or has ever occurred a transformation of a lower and simpler into a higher and more complex form, he is not able from his own position to determine. He waits patiently for the results of scientific research, quite ready to accept any ascertained instance of transformation of what the natural sciences call species, genera, families, orders, classes, series; recognizing, as he does, that reason and much more faith are in no wise compromised should it be discovered that an amœba has in the lapse of ages, in virtue of forces inherent in its bit of protoplasm and the influence of environment along its line of progress, eventually evolved into an orang-outang.

On the other hand, whilst philosophy takes this serene outlook, biology is down amongst the complexities of living organisms—searching, experimenting with infinite patience for instances of *morphological* transitions. The biologist "wants to know whether an inorganic molecule has ever of itself developed into a living cell; whether minerals have ever been able to transform themselves into plants, plants into animals and finally into man; whether man shall evolve further either to advance or recede in the scale of beings" (p. 81).

This statement, it may be thought, does not sufficiently differentiate the biologist's viewpoint. It leaves him to solve substantially the same problems that confront the philosopher,

only that whilst the latter is concerned about the question of *essence*, he is busied about that of *form* or structure. Both inquirers are looking for the links between the *kingdoms* of nature, though their respective interest in the *forms* that are linked differ. Indeed, it may be allowed that M. Didiot has not drawn with satisfactory fulness the biologist's field of inquiry. From his context, however, one may easily gather that he means that field to include the transitional lines between all the degrees—series, classes, orders, families, genera, species—into which the biological sciences classify the hierarchy of living forms.

The biological problem would then be concerned not so much with the connections between the *kingdoms*—this is more especially the problem of philosophy—as with the fact of transgression from the lower to a higher division within the kingdom. In other words the biologist wants to know in how far, if at all, the classifications that science makes of living forms are fixed by nature. Are the *artificial* divisions, series, classes, families, genera, species, likewise *natural?*

At all events, the reader will notice that the point at which Canon Didiot has placed the philosopher's main interest in evolutionism differs considerably from that at which it has usually been placed by the writers of the standard text-books and courses of philosophy. In these the concept species covers the aggregate of properties common and essential to a number of individuals What properties are essential are recognized by their immutability along the line of descent—an immutability which leaves room, however, for accidental departures from the specific type, thus giving rise to varieties and races within the species.

So far so good. There is little difficulty in defining what the concept of species means in the abstract. The crux arises when we come to fit the definition into the concrete. Wisely therefore does the latest—and, by the way, the most learned, if not the most profound—writer on neo-Scholasticism leave the difficulty unsettled. It is not ours, he says, to define what organisms should be ascribed to species essentially different and what to varieties or classes accidentally different. For so close is the relationship of many divisions (*ordinum*) that their distribution is extremely difficult for even the most experienced mind. For us it suffices to say

that there are very many classes (*ordines*) of organic beings which differ from one another in a principle intrinsic to their essence (ex interno principio essentiae indito).[2] To the same effect writes Urráburu, an equally profound and scarcely less erudite authority on philosophy. Though these writers refuse to designate the classes of living forms to which the term *species* may be rigorously applied as expressing the typical essence, it may be fair to suppose that they would draw the line at what biology calls *genera*, classes summing up the properties common to biological species; *e. g.*, the dog and cat (*genus* canis and *genus* felis). In that case the so-called species of dog would be only varieties or races of the genus, and the same with the cat, lion, tiger, panther. The domestic cat, for instance, might thus be conceived as an accidentally variant form sprung from a pair embodying the original typical form; whilst this form would represent an essentially and therefore specifically different type from that from which the present varieties or races of the dog (might not the wolf, fox, etc., be included?) have descended. We have no space here at command to enter upon the arguments for or against either of these ways of determining the philosopher's view of objective species and his consequent interest in evolutionism. We wish simply to observe that the view expressed by M. Didiot is another indication of the growing tendency manifested by a number of Catholic philosophers in favor of a moderate form of transformism—a form which while eschewing the wild exaggeration of monism and materialism embodies the evolutionary idea as a more or less probable hypothesis.

Father Wasmann on Evolutionism.—An instance of a much more pronounced tendency in the same direction appeared in the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* for last September, in an article entitled *Thoughts on Evolutionism*, by the well-known entomologist, Father Wasmann. The paper was occasioned by certain articles that had previously appeared in the German press under the captious heading, *A Jesuit Defender of Darwinism.* An explanation was evidently urgent. Father Wasmann reviews the conflict that has been waging during the past forty years between the advocates of the evolution of species on the one side and those of the stability of species on the other side.

[2] Pesch, *Institutionis Psych.*, vol. i, p. 221.

The appearance of Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 occasioned the fray. Darwinism soon became for the time the watchword of the evolutionary party. Now, however, that the smoke of battle has lifted somewhat, it is seen that the number of at least the scientific defenders of Darwinian theories as such is very small. The vast majority of those who stand for the mutability of species defend some other form of evolutionism than that which is based on the theory of natural selection in the struggle for existence. Alongside of the two main opposing armies is descried a corps of freebooters under the leadership of Ernst Haeckel. They make no little noise and confusion in the name of "science," but their arms are not of the best, nor is their object the triumph of truth, but rather the plundering of the Christian camp, which they suppose lies back of the centre of the opposing host.

Having surveyed the field and the *causa belli*, the writer drops the military figure and proceeds to discuss in more technical terms the meaning and value of Darwinism.

Meaning of the Term Darwinism.—Four different meanings have become associated with this term. In its first and proper sense it signifies the theory of *natural selection* as set forth by Darwin himself. In its second acceptation it designates an extension of the Darwinian theory to a world-view. Not only organic species, but the entire cosmical order is declared to have mechanically resulted as a "survival of the fittest" from the original chaos.

This is *Haeckelism*, realistic monism, or, better, materialistic atheism. A third use of the term Darwinism connects it with the extension of natural selection to the human race. It was only in 1871 that Darwin in his *Descent of Man* gave his theory this universal application. The fourth meaning of Darwinism rests on its transference from the theory of natural selection to that of organic descent in general. In this sense it designates the general theory of specific mutability as opposed to the opinion of those who maintain the direct created origin and immutability of species.

We cannot here follow Father Wasmann's criticism of the views embraced by the term Darwinism understood in the first three of these meanings. We can find room for but a few of his observations on the theory included under the fourth acceptation of the word.

What are we to hold regarding the evolution theory as such? Have present "systematic species" been always substantially as we now find them, or are they on the whole genetically related to one another and to their fossilized antecessors?

Are they the result of an historical evolution of the organic world, or were they originally created in their present condition? To answer these queries objectively we must set aside the abuses to which the general theory of descent has been subjected in the interest of atheistic materialism. Haeckelism is no glory to modern science. Nothing has so injured, so vulgarized the theory of evolution, and made it so distrusted by serious minds, as its association with materialistic monism. From this connection it must be sundered if its purely scientific value is to be estimated, and the elements of truth it contains assimilated to a consistent science of nature. In evaluating the theory of descent it must be borne in mind that it is in the first instance, and in its essence, a *scientific* theory. As such, therefore, it knows simply facts and law implied therein. The *origin of life* on our globe does not fall under its explanation.

Biology traces the unbroken succession of living forms and sums up the results of its observations and inductions in the *omne vivum e vivo, omnis cellula e cellula, omnis nucleus e nucleo.* Philosophy takes up the problem of *beginnings,* but it has no right to assume spontaneous generation as the origin of life. On the contrary, depending on the physical sciences as it does for its facts, its deductions, whilst transcending, must not contradict the data. Spontaneous generation has no standing in philosophy any more than it has in biology. What then, asks Father Wasmann, is the real sphere of evolutionism in so far as it is scientifically warranted? Its task is and must be, he answers, to establish the succession in which organic forms have appeared on our earth and thereby to declare the genetic relations of organisms one to another; moreover, it has to investigate the causes which underlie the gradual mutations of organic forms. In other words, the business of the theory of descent is to determine the actual and causal relations of the organic divisions at the head of which stand present "species," the highest offshoots of one or more hypothetically assumed original stocks.

But why appeal to a theory of evolution at all; why not suppose the constancy of "species," that "species" have been originally created in their present at least substantial form? It is here that the spontaneous tendency of the mind towards a unified conception of nature demands satisfaction. The Copernican system offers that satisfaction in so far as the planetary and stellar universe is concerned. The telescope reveals some of the heavenly bodies in actual process of evolution from a gaseous to a solid condition. The nebular hypothesis, starting from the activities manifested in these processes, endeavors to explain the development of the entire cosmical system and thus afford a unified conception of the anorganic universe.

As long ago as the days of St. Augustine it appeared to his broadly synthetic mind more worthy the might and wisdom of God to have created the primordial matter by a single creative act and have left the universe to develop according to the laws which He had impressed on the nature of the elements at their inception. God does not interfere immediately with the natural order where He can operate through the medium of natural causes. This is a fundamental law of the Christian world-view formulated three centuries ago by Suarez.

The question then lies close to hand, Does not this method of divine government rule the organic world? Geology and Paleontology reveal the historical succession of organisms in the remote past as a series reaching from the simplest forms of the earliest ages to the highly complex forms of the present time. Are the fauna and flora of to-day connected only in a time series with their fossil antecessors backwards to the dawn of life? Or does a genetic connection hold sway all along the line? The analogy of the rest of creation and the above principle of non-interference would seem to demand an affirmative answer to the latter question and to justify the theory of descent (in preference to that of multiplied creations) as the ultimate consequence of the Copernican world-view.

Father Wasmann offers several illustrations of what he considers cases of genetic descent. The Brachiopod genus *Lingula* is represented abundantly in the Silurian and Devonian strata, and various of its species run through the successive epochs up to the

present. Is not the inference legitimate that the present species of *Lingula* are truly the lineal descendants, modified in the lapse of ages, of the original forms fossilized in the Silurian beds? So too the four surviving "species" of the *nautili.* Notwithstanding mutations of structure they make a strong claim in favor of an unbroken family connection with fossilized ancestors of the Cambrian strata. Kindred claims are well established for the Phasmidae (spectre, walking-stick insect) and the Paussidae (a class of small beetles.)

Father Wasmann animadverts repeatedly on the exaggerations and abuses with which Haeckelism has degraded the theory of descent. He suggests what he considers the proper attitude of the Christian apologist at the present time. What is true in the theory of descent should be carefully separated from its false accretions. The Christian champion should strike with weapons wrenched from the hands of his adversaries. Taking heed from the mistakes of the quondam defenders of the Ptolemaic system, he should give up the defensive and boldy assume the offensive. No wholesale adoption of evolutionism is, of course, advocated. Gold and dross must be carefully separated. Philosophy and science must coöperate in the critical process.

The Judgment of Philosophy.—Now what does philosophy as such teach concerning the theory of organic descent? A highly probable inference from the cosmical and geological development of the universe, the theory could be vetoed by philosophy only in the supposition that the present "species" could be demonstrated to be fixed, substantially unalterable, and their genetic descent from ancestral simpler types proved consequently to be impossible. This Father Wasmann claims philosophy cannot demonstrate. The subject lies outside its sphere. It belongs to the biological sciences. Philosophy rightly demands of course that the development of organic forms shall be assigned to an adequate cause. As the origin of matter and the laws of its development must be ascribed to the First Cause, personal and creative and distinct from the universe, so also the primitive forms of life demand the interference, immediate or mediate, of the same divine power. Philosophy, however, does not decide that this interference must be creative in the strict sense of this term. Production or eduction from the

potencies implanted in the primordial matter by the Creator suffices. How many original organisms were thus produced, neither philosophy nor science has any means of determining. Probably the differentiation lay at plant and animal. But how many of these classes of organisms were produced, and in how many localities, philosophy is again unable to decide, whilst the records of geology furnish simply some indications that the oldest organisms—at the opening of the Paleozoic age—swam in the Polar Seas. Again, to the question whether the development of the plant world on the one hand and of the animal world on the other, emanated from one original type (monophylistic evolution) or simultaneously or successively from a number of types (polyphylistic evolution), philosophy can give no reply. Philosophy, moreover, has no information to offer as to the causes that stimulated and furthered organic evolution. Biology, however, proves that every organism is subject to laws of development *intrinsic* to its constitution, and from this philosophy rightly infers that the evolution of organism must essentially and in the main have proceeded and advanced under the sway of *internal* causes. Theories, therefore, of evolution based entirely on causes lying outside the organisms are futile and unphilosophical.

The intrinsic tendency and ability, moreover, to advance to a higher form must have been implanted by God in the primary ancestral types. But as regards the *nature* of the internal causes of evolution, and how they conspired with the external factors, philosophy again is silent.

But whilst philosophy is thus ignorant of the extent and method of vegetal and animal evolution, it has apodictic certitude as to the origin of the human soul. Here the evolutionary process of nature must halt and await the creative act. By no internal or external play of natural forces can matter ever become spirit, the "form" of the brute organism evolve into the soul of man. Between the purely animal world and the human there is fixed a chasm which the Creator alone can bridge. So much for the general attitude of philosophy.

The Judgment of Science.—From the standpoint of science evolutionism is a scientific *hypothesis*, and in its fullest form a scientific theory.

As such it claims and can as yet claim only more or less probability in its favor. Exaggerated estimates of its validity by its defenders must therefore be avoided no less than the underestimates of its growing verisimilitude from the side of its opponents.

Two theories on the nature and origin of organic species stand mutually opposed, each consisting of a group of cohering hypotheses. On the one hand there is the theory of the immutability of "systematic species." It denies a genetic relationship amongst successive species. It supposes for all the different species, whose present number aggregates at least eight hundred thousand, a special creative (productive?) act—which acts, moreover, must be immeasurably increased so as to embrace the species which the theory supposes to have existed in the beginning, and to have perished at the close of the various geological periods.

On the other side stands the theory of evolution. It supposes that "species" are only *relatively* constant for a certain geological period; then came shorter periods of transformation succeeded by larger periods of permanence of organic forms; at present we are living in one of these latter periods, and we thus find "species" to be normally constant. Now since specific and genetic notes differ only relatively, not fundamentally, the theory supposes evolutional descent to include the genera, and even the families, orders, and the other degrees of the organic kingdoms. It must be admitted, however, that as we ascend the biological scale the probabilities of genetic relation grow weaker. Genetic relation amongst species of the same genus is often highly probable, not infrequently the same holds for the genera of a family; often, too, for the families of the same order. But as we reach the higher classes and series, the probability of a genetic relationship gives way to a probability in the opposite direction. Hence, among the more critical defenders of evolutionism there is on the whole a tendency to a polyphylistic rather than a monophylistic evolutionism. But how many original types whence organic evolution proceeeded there may have been, only the exuberant phantasy of Haeckel would attempt to decide. Linné, the father of organic classification, has said: *Tot species numeramus quot ab initio creavit infinitum ens.* If the term "species" be here taken to indicate not the organic form it stands for in artificial classification, but for

the "natural species," evolutionists will readily accept the Linnean basis of computation, modified thus: *We number as many "natural species" as there were initial forms produced by God.*

But what use, it may be asked, is the distinction here made between artificial or systematic and natural species, if we are unable to determine what forms actually constitute a natural species, and how many natural species there are?

Father Wasmann declares that in not a few instances we are able, at least in some degree, to indicate the forms that come under a natural species. He cites a number of such cases, amongst them we may mention the present horse (*genus* equus), which he thinks probably constitutes with its fossil progenitors, traceable as far back as the Eocene period, a veritable "natural species." Moreover, the distinction enables us to set up a firm philosophical platform, upon which the doctrine of creation and the evolutionary theory may meet in friendly relations, and a vantage point for the defence of the Christian conception of the universe.

It is a favorite tactic of the monist to strike at the doctrine of creation by attacking the opinion of the permanency of "species." If we maintain that only "natural species" in their original form were produced by God and leave the determination of the number and range of the primordial types to the progress of science, we shall have at least dissociated the Christian conception of the universe from the theory of specific permanence, which our enemies would fain identify therewith in order to cast ridicule on the whole. Moreover, the evolutionary idea enlarges and ennobles our conception of the Creator's power and wisdom, which provided from the beginning the material forces and forms of activity needed to bring the entire scheme of things to its final development without requiring reiterated intervention on His part.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE APOSTLES' CREED, ITS ORIGIN, ITS PURPOSE, AND ITS HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION. By A. C. McGiffert, Washburn Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1902. Pp. vi—206. Price 4s. net.

Professor McGiffert has here reprinted in a readable and very clearly printed form a lecture delivered by him at the Harvard University Summer School of Theology, later before the University of Chicago, and (partially) at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, held at Detroit a year or two back. He has kept substantially to his original text, except for certain changes which further study has made necessary, and for diverse critical notes which considerably enhance the value of the treatise. The lecture possesses more than an ephemeral interest, and the professor has conferred a boon upon students by his republication of it. Its purport is the defence of the two positions in regard to the origin and object of the Apostles' Creed with which his name is associated in America, viz.: (1) that the date of the ancient creed of the Church in Rome, of which the so-called "Apostles' Creed" is the offspring, is approximately A.D. 150; and (2) that its purpose was an apologetic one—to defend the main dogmas of Christianity as then formulated, against the attacks of Marcionite heretics.

The old Roman symbol (a shorter form of the present Creed) is quoted by Tertullian[1] in North Africa and by St. Irenaeus[2] in Southern Gaul. The latter Father is considered by the author to be the earliest witness to its existence. He brushes aside as unimportant the fact that many of its phrases are common in the earliest Christian writings, and relies mainly on its total absence from the *Didache*—a document chiefly concerned with pre-baptismal instruction—as conclusive evidence that it was not in use during the first quarter of the second century.

[1] *De Praescript. Haeretic.*, 13, 14, 21; *De Virg. Veland*, 1; *Adv. Prax.*, 2, 3; *De Corona*, 3.

[2] *Adv. Haer.*, i, 10, 1; i, 22, 1; iii, 3, 3; iii, 4, 2; iv, 33, 7; v, 20, 1.

From the references in Tertullian and St. Irenaeus the author considers it evident that the Symbol was originally designed as a baptismal confessional—"a form of words in which the convert should declare his faith." But he goes a step further and answers his own query—"How are we to account for the existence in the late second century of an elaborate baptismal confession in which all the emphasis is on belief and not a word is said about conduct?"—by maintaining that it was directed against one form of error only, that propagated by Marcion. According to the latter, the God of the Jews was wholly distinct from the God of the Christians, who was neither creator nor ruler of the world as revealed in the Old Testament. This virtual Dualism cut at the root of the divine unity, the divine omnipotence, the divine providence, and it was against it that the first article of the Roman Symbol: "I believe in God the Father Almighty" (lit., "all controlling," "all governing": παντοκράτωρ), was directed. The second article likewise was not intended, Professor McGiffert thinks, "as a summary of what the Christians of the second century believed about Christ," but as a refutation of the Marcionite denial of the divine Sonship.[3] And the detailed reference to the incidents of the Incarnate Life is taken as a repudiation of the Docetism of Marcion, who, in common with the Gnostics, denied the reality of Christ's human nature. The omission of our Lord's baptism is explained by the exaggeration of it by the Docetic sects.

In thus attributing the object of the Symbol exclusively to a controversial desire to meet the negations of the chief heretics of the time by the counter-statements of orthodoxy, Professor McGiffert parts company with authorities of the reputation of Harnack and Kattenbusch who consider the Creed to have been drawn up with a missionary or evangelistic purpose quite independently of existing errors. He does not so much answer their arguments (which he admits at one time convinced him) as state in a positive form the evidence to be drawn from the nature of the various articles. The weak point in his position is undoubtedly the insertion of the clause: "I believe in

[3] Marcion asserted that Christ was the son of an inferior deity, not of God of the the Old Testament.

[4] Another article unconnected with Marcion was that on Christ's Resurrection. But this argument cannot be pressed, as contemporary writers like Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* ii, 27; iii, 8, 11, 19; iv, 21, 43; v, 5, 7, 20; *De Carne Xti*, 5) represent Marcion as being *logically* bound to deny the doctrine, although in fact he accepted it.

. . . Holy Spirit'') πνεῦμα ἅγιον without the definite article.[4] The Person of the Holy Ghost did not come within the range of Marcionite doctrine; the article, therefore, could have had no polemic purpose. And what was true of one clause might be true of all. The author does not attempt to meet the difficulty, but dismisses the subject airily in a paragraph of twelve lines with the weak plea that "*evidently* (*sic*) the mention of the Holy Spirit in the Creed was due simply to its occurrence in the baptismal formula upon which the Creed was based.''

Yet, on the whole, we think that the balance of probability is in his favor. Of course, if it could be proved that the ancient Symbol existed in Rome anterior to the heresy of Marcion, his case would fall to the ground. Kattenbusch, indeed, strives to find traces of the several articles in the writings of Justin Martyr, but the references are altogether too obscure to carry conviction to any unbiassed mind, and Professor McGiffert adduces strong negative evidence from the *Apology* (I, 61, 65–7) where, in a detailed description of baptism, there is no mention of the Creed, to show that the Roman Symbol was then unknown. (*Cf.* Harnack's *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1894, pp. 147 ff.)

The two writers are in agreement for once in their view that the Creed originated in Rome. Professor McGiffert, notwithstanding the importance of the point (for one of his strongest arguments in favor of the influence of the Marcionite heresy in the formation of the Symbol lies in the well-known prevalence of that heresy among the Roman Christians of the second century), contents himself with a somewhat cursory survey of the arguments on both sides. The older view, maintained by Zahn (*Das apostolische Symbolum*, pp. 37 ff.), by Casperi (a Norwegian theologian, the most voluminous writer on the subject of the Apostles' Creed) in his *Quellen*, Bd. III, p. 161, and recently by Professor Sanday of Oxford (*Journal of Theol. Studies*, Oct. 1899, pp. 3 ff.), placed the origin in the East, whence the Creed was later imported by Greek converts into the Imperial City. Although the author admits the force of the argument adduced by the last named of the above writers from the presence in the Eastern fourth century creeds of words and phrases lacking in the Roman Symbol, as we know it from Rufinus *Expositio Symboli*,[5] (A. D. 400) and a letter of Marcellus of Ancyra (A. D. 340), but reproduced by

[5] Migne, P.L., vol. xxi, col. 335–386.

St. Irenaeus,—he thinks that it may "fairly be concluded . . . that the Roman Symbol originated in Rome, not in the Orient."

As to the Apostles' Creed (merely an amplification of the Roman), the author gives it as his opinion that it "probably" had its birthplace in Gaul—a view defended by Harnack.[6] Its Western origin is plainly written on the enlargements which differentiate it from its parent. It is true that one addition "descended into hell" appeared first in Italy; and another, "eternal life," in North Africa, but both are found also later on in the texts of Western Europe." There is no possible ambiguity about the nature of the type of other additions, such as "creatorem coeli et terrae," "qui conceptus est," "passus et mortuus," "Dei omnipotentis," "catholicam," "communionem sanctorum."

Space forbids us to do more than mention an interesting account of the way in which the Western form of the Roman Creed became the baptismal creed of the Roman Church and filtered down through the centuries as the Apostles' Creed; with a digression on the growth of the legend ascribing the authorship to the Twelve. Of interest also is an elaborate dissertation on the Historical Interpretation of the ancient Roman Symbol,—special stress being laid upon the article on the Resurrection of Christ;—and a shorter critical note on the baptismal formula and its relation to the Creed.

Many of the Professor's theological statements are by no means as satisfactory as his main line of reasoning. Apart from his reference to Marcion's "radical Paulinism," his remarks on the Virgin Birth leave much to be desired. Not only does he assert that it was not "universally believed at the time when the Roman Symbol was composed," and that it "can hardly have originated with Matthew or Luke," but he goes on to say that "anyone (*sic*) who believed that Christ was really born and that His life was not a mere phantom, *even though he did not believe that Christ was born of a virgin*, was in accord with the spirit of the article 'Born of the Virgin Mary'"—and this although he admits that the author of the clause believed in "the miraculousness and uniqueness of Christ's birth" (p. 122).

Apart from its doctrinal blemishes, the book, which is of moderate price and of convenient size, deserves to be carefully studied as a well-balanced exposition of a subject that has lately been much discussed in non-Catholic religious circles.

[6] Kattenbusch is at first undecided on the subject, but in his second volume he places the origin in Burgundy (II, pp. 790 ff.).

VEXATA QUAESTIO, or What shall we do with the Friar? A brief sketch of three centuries of history in the Philippines. By W. Brecknock Watson. Part I. Manila: Impr. "Amigos del Pais." 1901. Pp. 44.

THE PHILIPPINE FRIARS. (1) Protest of the Catholic Centre Party; (2) Father Firmin San Julian's Statement; (3) Stephen Bonsal's Article from the "North American Review." Brooklyn, N. Y. City: International Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 20.

THE KATIPUNAN. An Illustrated Historical and Biographical Study of the Society which brought about the Insurrection of 1896—98 and 1899. Taken from Spanish State Documents. Manila: Imp. "Amigos del Pais." 1902. Pp. 335.

The quaint English of the two pamphlets *Vexata Quaestio* and *The Katipunan*, published by the Spanish press association, "Amigos del Pais," of Manila, does not lessen the value of the facts contained in them and their immediate importance for the American reader, who is thereby made familiar with the conditions of the present strife in the Philippines. This is particularly true of the little book dealing with the formation and influence of the native secret society which, supported by malcontents and ambitious politicians in Spain, managed to poison the minds of the Filipino population against the home government and those who most effectually represented that government by maintaining principles of law and order through the influence of religion. The reports of the officials cited in this pamphlet are, it appears, entirely trustworthy. We hope to return to this subject in a more extended treatment from competent hands in our next issue.

The three papers published by the Catholic Truth Society of Brooklyn are already known through their having appeared in the newspapers, but it is well to have the statements from these representative sources in this permanent form.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS Beatae Mariae Virgini dicatum. Auctore Fr. Josepho Calasanctio Card. Vives, O. M. Cap. Editio septima, aucta et emendata. Romae, Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci: Fridericus Pustet. 1902. Pp. 668. Price, $1.25.

This is a truly serviceable *Compendium of Moral Theology* for the use alike of students and clergy, and deserves the widest circulation everywhere. It differs from the popular text-books, such as Lehmkuhl, Aertnys, Sabetti, Bierbaum, Konings, or Tanquerey, in being much more succinct than any of these. On the other hand it is more com-

plete than the summaries of Melata or the older manual of Togni; and although these are helpful for recapitulation at examinations for ordination, they do not treat the entire range of moral topics exhaustively enough to equip the student for practice in the sacred ministry, except with the aid of a larger reference work. But here we have everything well digested, and yet without entering into hypothetical cases or lengthy argumentation as to varying opinions touching matters in which it is possible to adopt at once a safe opinion serviceable in practice. The definitions are clear, the principles distinctly stated, and the decisions rounded by references to authentic sources. It is quite up-to-date in the matter of citing of decrees, and altogether it offers itself as a genuine aid for review study and a sharpening of that theological faculty which helps the priest to solve cases of conscience by resort to fundamental teaching, instead of merely looking for precedent cases in the traditions of casuistry. The dedication itself which the erudite Cardinal, nobly proud of his humble Franciscan allegiance, makes to the Virgin Mother of Good Counsel, inspires the earnest student who takes up the volume with confidence in the wisdom of its contents. The price, too, is so low that it appears as if the book were only seeking to be read.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE: An Argument and Plea for the Old English Sunday. By the Rev. F. Meyrick, M.A. London: Skeffington & Son. Pp. xv—213. Price, 3s. 6d.

The first question that naturally arises from the perusal of the title is, What does Canon Meyrick mean by the "Old English Sunday" which he wishes to revive? An answer will be found in his third chapter, where he essays to prove that the Christian Sabbath is a "reformation and adaptation of the existing Jewish Sabbath." He condemns the mediæval observance of Sunday as lax, and has not a good word for the innocent amusements indulged in on that day by his post-Reformation forefathers, who were untouched by Puritanical fanaticism. In fact, his view of the observance of the Lord's Day is diametrically opposed to the usual notion of what took place on an "Old English Sunday." He will have nothing to do with the mildest form of recreation on the weekly Feast of the Resurrection, which to his mind differs nothing from the Jewish Sabbath. He would banish from it as a thing of evil every harmless pleasure, even on the part of the careworn toilers whose labors only cease with the ending of the week, and stamp as a violation of a Divine command any in-

dulgence of a secular nature. He attempts to twist Scripture to his purpose in this wise:—"The Mosaic interpretation was softened by Christ. The injunctions of Moses are not formally abrogated, nor was the sanctity of the Sabbath diminished by one jot or tittle; but a more spiritual manner of sanctifying the day than that which takes the form of refusing to perform the external acts is found. If, however, the Christian form of observance is in that respect less severe than the Jewish, in other respects it is even more stringent, for it binds not only the act but the intention, and . . . it covers a far wider ground, not being confined to this and that specified thing, but affecting the whole of the conduct." The longest chapter of the work is devoted to answering in the negative the question: "Should Sunday be made a day of greater amusement?" Why "greater," we wonder, seeing that Canon Meyrick considers *any* amusement unlawful? He even refuses to sanction such an educational form of pleasure as the frequentation of museums and art-galleries by those artisans, shop-keepers, clerks, and the like, whose business during the week prevents them from entering them at other times.

The chapter in question is taken up with an attempted reply to two very pertinent objections: (1) That the prohibition of amusements turns the Christian Lord's Day into a Judaical Sabbath; (2) That the introduction of further amusements would have the effect of refining and elevating the masses. His answer to the first objection is of the weakest, merely consisting of a number of disjointed quotations from St. Augustine, Prudentius, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret, to show that Jews in the early part of the Christian era admitted amusements on their Sabbath. This is the veriest *ignoratio elenchi*, since the point in dispute is not the practice prevalent in the Jewish Church *after* the advent of Christ, but the stringency of the Mosaic law certainly observed in its fulness *during* His earthly lifetime, seeing that He more than once denounced the Pharisaism that made man exist for the Sabbath, not the Sabbath for man.

The argument in reply to the second objection is considerably stronger, and with some of it we are in cordial agreement. It is unfortunately perfectly true that a large section of the wealthy classes do desecrate the Christian Day of Rest without the shadow of an excuse. Pleasure parties, boating excursions, concerts, elaborate luncheon and dinner parties, have become more the rule than the exception on Sunday with a certain section of society. How much needless labor this wanton violation of the one day of the week that

should be observed as in some way sacred to God, entails upon the already hard-worked members of a lower class, needs no demonstration. We answer at once in the negative Canon Meyrick's indignant query, "Can there be any possible good in giving one more day of idle pleasure to those who can make any other day, if they please, a day of pleasure?"

But he spoils the undoubted force of his contention by exaggeration. Because the rich and idle abuse Sunday is no valid reason why the poor and hard-worked should not make lawful use of it. What is that lawful use? Does it forbid the various forms of innocent recreation, mental and bodily, which relax the mind and brace the body to undergo cheerfully and strenuously the labors of another week? Assuredly not. Christ's strongest reproofs were addressed to those who would destroy the freedom of action which made men God's children, serving Him lovingly and willingly, and not His slaves groaning under the whip of a harsh law. The Pharisaism that would close even a museum or a picture-gallery to a seamstress on Sunday merits His rebuke as much as the "upright men" of His day who bound "burdens on men's shoulders grievous to be borne."

The fallacy of Canon Meyrick's whole line of reasoning lies in the sharp distinction which he makes between "religious" and "secular" acts. Sunday to him should be devoted to psalm-singing, Bible-reading, worship, and religious meditation; anything outside those narrow limits should be shunned. But this is to forget the sacredness of the commonest things. "The earth"—not one part of it only—"is the Lord's and the fulness thereof;" the *whole* man, body as well as spirit, belongs to God, and has to be employed in His service. No amusement need be secular, *i.e.*, out of all relation to Christ,—no indulgence tabooed as sinful, so long as the intention is good. The young man who worships God in God's own appointed way on Sunday morning, and plays a game of cricket or football in the afternoon, is performing in either case a lawful act. He is developing his body, making it the better able to bear the fatigues of six days' labor, while not forgetting his spiritual duty to his Maker. Canon Meyrick sneers at the French Sunday; but he does not mention the comparative attendance at church in France and in England. The Rev. Dr. Linklater, an Anglican clergyman of wide experience in the East End of London, gives a graphic description of the quiet of an English Sunday. Nothing, he tells us, can be more appalling than that mingling of a brutish stupor, the after-effects of a Saturday-

night carousal, with utter irreligion. The bread-earner rises towards noon, after reading his sporting Sunday paper in bed, and joins his slatternly wife in a heavy dinner—the great event of the day—which makes him drowsy until the public houses are open. His "day of rest" is a day of absolute animalism.

The author in his severe strictures on the French Sunday should, moreover, have mentioned two facts: first, that France does not stand alone in this respect, but is on precisely the same footing as all other European countries, Protestant quite as much as Catholic; and secondly, that there is an influential Society sanctioned by the Church, having its headquarters in Paris itself, to promote the better observance of the day.

In spite of a good deal in it that calls for criticism, the book has some points to be praised. The chapter on the practice of the Primitive Christians as to Sunday observance is well written; the many extracts from early writers, such as St. Justin Martyr, St. Ignatius, and Pliny, are well-chosen, and the section on the Agape is particularly interesting. We also note later on an eloquent passage from a sermon by Padre Agostino di Montifeltro, and there are some wise extracts from the Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, a writer who adopts a far saner line than Canon Meyrick. But we cannot say much in recommendation of a book conceived in such a harsh, Puritanical, almost Pharisaic spirit, written with so much exaggeration alike of sentiment and argument, and lacking so completely a sound common sense, not to speak of Christian charity.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS. By Saint Thomas Aquinas. Edited, with Introduction, by the Very Rev. Father John Proctor, S.P.M., Ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. London: Sands & Co. 1902. Pp. 488. Price, 6s.

Father Proctor tells us in his interesting Introduction that this is the first translation into English of two little known, but highly practical, works of the Angelic Doctor. They are to be found among the seventy-two *Opuscula* or Tracts. The first had for its original title, "Against those who attack religion, that is, the religious profession," and was published, according to Fleury, the great French historian, in A. D. 1257, having been read before the Pope the previous year at Anagni. "In it," he adds, "the holy Doctor answers, in detail, and with logical precision, the reasons and authorities which were brought forward by William of St. Amour."[1] It was in fact an

[1] *Hist. Eccl.*, t. V, l. 84, n. 42.

Apology for the Mendicant Friars, together with an exposure of the unjust accusations brought against religious in general.

The translator has adopted this heading for the two treatises—the second, "Against those who would deter men from entering religion," being of like tenor with the first, although hardly so important. He justifies their publication in a popular form on the plea that a work from the pen of one of the greatest theological lights of any age cannot fail to be of peculiar interest to many at the present time, when, no less than in the thirteenth century, the religious orders "in France, in Spain, in Portugal, in Italy"—he might have added "in the Philippines"—"are passing through a crisis, which, though not a 'new thing' in their annals, is, to say the least, searching and severe"

In his Introduction of some forty pages, Father Proctor dilates in somewhat rhetorical, not to say rhapsodical, fashion on the persecutions from without and from within, that have tried "as by fire" the religious orders of the Church ever in the forefront of the battle. "They have ever been the spiritual uhlans, and advanced guard of the battalions of the Church, (and) consequently must expect to bear the brunt of the enemies' lance and spear." Yet they need never fear of the ultimate issue of the trial. "They may be subjected to the ordeal of fire, but their garments will not be scorched by the flames. He who protected Israel will protect them." Their past history of struggle and persecution is the sure pledge of present victory. "The death and burial are the harbinger of a glorious resurrection." We are glad to note that the learned writer does not hesitate to admit that these attacks have not always been without cause. "Religious," he says with much truth, "are not always religious. They do not at all times, and in all places, live up to their sacred calling. *Cucullus non facit monachum.* . . . A Judas in the college of the chosen twelve, a Nicolas amongst the deacons in apostolic days, a Julian in the early ages of the Christian faith, are historic instances, which have prepared us for the existence of occasional infidelity to the principles and practices of the higher life, amongst members of the religious orders. Religious men and women, like other men and women, are human . . . There have been times, there have been countries—there may be countries to-day—where the water and fire and the fan were, and perhaps are, needed. It is better for the body that the cancer should be removed by the surgeon's knife."

The rest of this part of the Introduction is taken up with a particularly clear and concise summary of the spirit and organization of the "active orders," and more especially of the great order of St.

Dominic,—the *Dominicani* or "watch-dogs of the Lord." Father Proctor argues ingeniously that the Friars of the Middle Ages ought to appeal forcibly to the minds of English-thinking and English-speaking people of the present day. The constitution of the Dominican Order, for example, is essentially democratic; its spirit is liberal, its government is elective. Each convent is governed by a Prior chosen by the community, subject to the approval of the Provincial. The Provincials are chosen by the representatives of each Priory, subject to the approval of the General who is himself elected by the Provincials and others selected by the members of each Province for that purpose—his election being subject to the consent of the Pope. Hence unity of organization, based on freedom, is the proud boast of the Order to which St. Thomas has given a world-wide celebrity. It is the glory of the Dominican Friars that, "like the robe of Christ, their Order has remained seamless and undivided for nearly seven hundred years"—the outward and visible sign of the essential unity existing among its members.

Father Proctor devotes the last twenty pages of his elaborate Preface to a narration of the attack made by William of St. Amour, a doctor of the Sorbonne who out-Abelarded Abelard (if we may coin a phrase) in his bitterness against the then newly instituted Orders of Friars. Abelard only attacked the Orders incidentally by inveighing against their abuses; St. Amour, "the violent and turbulent Doctor of the Sorbonne, aimed at the very heart of the religious system." His chief work was entitled "De Periculo Novissimorum Temporum," and it was in fact, though not in name, a fierce diatribe against the Friars of the new Order, to whom he applies the solemn words of St. Paul to Timothy (II. Ep. 3: 1–7). The work was delated to the Holy See by the saintly King Louis of France, a life-long friend of the Friars. He sent two doctors of theology to Anagni, the residence of the Papal Court, to protest against its errors and to defend the maligned Orders. S. Bonaventure represented the Franciscans, and several unnamed Dominicans accompanied him. Pope Alexander IV appointed two commissions to examine the work, and among the members of the second tribunal (all of whom were Dominicans) was St. Thomas Aquinas. The General of the Order singled him out to refute St. Amour. His treatise "Against those who attack the religious profession" was the fruit of his obedience. After a brief Prologue on the scope of his work, the Saint begins by explaining the nature of the religious life and shows that its perfection consists in the facility which it affords of uniting the soul to God by detachment from

all earthly ties. "Perfection of religious life depends [he concludes with characteristic largeness of spiritual outlook] more upon interior justice than upon external abstinence." He then proceeds to consider *seriatim* the objections of his adversary. According to his usual method (familiar to all students of the *Summa*), he first states with a fulness that leaves nothing to be desired—a characteristic imitated by Cardinal Newman in our own day—the opponent's arguments, and then refutes them convincingly. These arguments are concerned with the following knotty problems:—(1) Whether it be lawful for a religious to teach; (2) Whether he may belong to a *college* of secular teachers; (3) Whether a religious, not charged with the care of souls, may lawfully preach and hear confessions; (4) Whether a religious be bound to manual labor; (5) Whether he may renounce all that he possesses, retaining no property, either private or common; (6) whether a religious, especially one belonging to a Mendicant Order, may lawfully live on alms.

Taking the treatment of the last question as typical of the treatment of the rest, we find that St. Thomas begins the discussion by citing eleven arguments of his opponent, drawn from Deut. 16: 19; Prov. 22: 7; 1 Tim. 5, and the gloss. on St. Mark 6: 8, etc., against receiving alms in general, and further arguments against begging, even on the part of preachers. He refutes these contentions by appealing to Scripture (1 Cor. 9: 2, 7; 2 Tim. 2: 5; Psalm 39: 18; 69: 6; 108: 17; St. Luke 19: 5; St. Mark 11: 11; 2 Cor. 8: 9; etc.), to the example of SS. Benedict (see St. Gregory's Dialogues, 1, 2), and Alexis, "the beggar of God," and the teaching of St. Augustine (*De op. monach.*), St. Jerome (*Cp. ad Ocean.*, and *contra Vigilant.*); and Aristotle (*Ethics IV and VIII*).

The rest of the *opusculum* is taken up with a reply to such objections against religious as the coarseness of their habit (!), their constant travelling ("for the good of souls," the Saint adds), for their studies and systematic preaching, for going to law, for frequenting the courts of sovereigns, for being the ambassadors of Antichrist (from a mistaken interpretation of 2 Tim. 3: 5), and even for actions manifestly good, such as prayer and fasting.

The second treatise (*Opusculum* XVII)[2] is much shorter than the first (*Opusculum* XIX[3]). Its purport may be summarized as a detailed treatment of vocation to the religious life, together with an answer to such questions as to whether the young, whether recent converts,

[2] In the Parma edition of St. Thomas' works it is *Opusc.* III.

[3] In the Parma edition of St. Thomas' works it is *Opusc.* I.

whether sinners of a deep dye, may embrace religion. The wisdom of vows is discussed; and the circumstances under which they are lawful are clearly stated. Community life and religious poverty, in their obligations, are dispassionately considered with all the Angelic Doctor's customary clearness and sharply-defined precision.

It will be seen that the work is of a most practical nature. Its object is to foster vocations, and to guide both directors in dealing with penitents and individual souls striving to enter the straight way leading to perfect life. There is a wealth of homely illustration, an abundance of Scriptural quotations, and an intimate knowledge of human nature in its strange blending of weakness and strength, spiritual yearnings and sensual cravings, in both parts of the volume, that should make it find a permanent home in England and America. We need only add that Father Proctor has done his work of translation fully and well, allowing St. Thomas to present his own thoughts, arguments, and counsel, without adventitious assistance, but in an intelligible form, to the English-speaking reader, who owes the translator a debt of gratitude as much for his introduction, as for the care he has bestowed upon the table of contents and index no less than upon the treatises themselves.

SUMMULA PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE ad usum adolescentium Seminarii B. Mariae de Monte Melleario concinnata. Vol. I. Logica et Ontologia. Dublin: Browne and Nolan. 1902.

The modest title of this volume, a small summary of scholastic philosophy for the use of the seminarians at Mt. Mellary (Ireland), may lead the reader interested in its type of subject-matter to pass over the work as having only a local purpose and adaptation. Such an inference, however, if right, would not be true. Though indeed a summary it is sufficiently large, with its four hundred pages, to cover comprehensively something more than the barest essentials of logic and ontology. If the other sections of the contemplated course are to receive proportionate treatment, the work when completed will rank in extent with such well received authorities as Liberatore, Zigliara, Farges, etc. A little examination of its contents shows, moreover, that as regards the plan, method, development, and last, but not least, the material make-up of the book itself, it is not undeserving a place beside these standard authors.

Though the nature of the subject leaves little scope for originality, and the modest writer would be the first to disclaim all aiming at such a quality, it possesses a feature deserving of special notice, viz.,

its references to corresponding literature in English. Harper, the Stonyhurst Series, M'Cosh, and other kindred authorities are drawn upon with the advantage of not only clarifying the text, but of accustoming the student to express scholastic arguments in modern speech, a pedagogical discipline especially to be emphasized in these days.

BIBLIOTHEQUE DU CONGRÈS INTERNATIONAL DE PHILOSOPHIE. IV. Histoire de la Philosophie. Pp. 529. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 5 Rue de Mézieres. 1902.

The present volume completes the series devoted to the essays prepared for discussion at the International Congress of Philosophy held at the last Paris Exposition. The three preceding volumes contained the papers on General Philosophy and Metaphysics, Logic, Ethics and History of the Sciences. The contents of the volume at hand include a large range of subjects selected from wide fields in the history of philosophy. The first three papers, contributed respectively by Professors Boutroux of the Sorbonne, Deussen of Kiel, and Gourd of Geneva, deal with the object, method and progress of the history of philosophy. The next four discuss various aspects of Plato's system. The two following treat of certain Aristotelian concepts. There are also studies on the inductive logic of the Epicurean school; on the value of scholasticism; on Descartes' doctrine of memory; on Boyle's principle of morality; on Hume and the critical philosophy; on Kant's teaching as to the notion of experience; on the Swedish philosophy during the first half of the nineteenth century; on the idea and method of Compte's philosophy. The closing paper treats of the philosophy of Nietsche. It need hardly be said that the essays are greatly condensed in order to cover so much ground. Their value for the student consists in their bringing together in a convenient form the views on their respective subjects of many writers prominent in the contemporary world of philosophy.

THE REPRESENTATIVE MEN OF THE BIBLE. By George Matheson, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., formerly Minister of the Parish of St. Bernard's, Edinburgh. London: Hodden & Stoughton. 1902. Pp. 369.

By "representative men" Dr. Matheson informs us that he means those who "represent phases of humanity irrespective of place and time," and he considers them in his volume only "in those incidents in which they *are* thus representative." He stands, as it were, in a studio and selects certain portraits for discussion. [He disarms criticism of his omissions; *e.g.*, Lot and Isaias, surely "representative men," are not mentioned, by promising to treat other characters in

a future volume.] In a preliminary chapter he dilates somewhat fancifully on the world-galleries whose walls are hung with paintings of characteristic human types—the Chinese gallery with its great collection of heroes, possessing an ideal but incapable of progress; the Indian gallery where the portraits "express only one attitude—the face upturned to the height, the hand outstretched to grasp the mist upon the mountains;" and the galleries of Greece and Rome—the one presenting the type of moderation, the other a life of hard, unlovely discipline. None of these galleries reveal more than the *accidental* features of man; they lack the note of universality. The Jewish nation alone produced *representative* men, figures, that is to say, that revealed human nature in its myriad varieties, its complex phases as changing as the waters of an ever-flowing stream. The portraits of the Jewish gallery make us forget the environment of their subjects. And the reason is because they are "all portraits of youth —the age of spontaneity. . . . They are men of the morning . . . the burden and heat of life's day has not caused them to wax old."

True to this characteristic of his types, the author begins with the consideration of "Adam the Child." The story of the first man is often ridiculed as childish. "So it is," says Dr. Matheson, "but why? Because it is a description of childhood itself. . . . The man who painted Adam has done what neither the ancient Pagan world nor the Mediæval Christian world succeeded in doing." [The latter because it magnified the childhood of Jesus by making it miraculous.] "He has painted a real child, a type of all childhood." The author then proceeds to illustrate Adam's simplicity, his wants, his sense of beauty, his sense of possession. He drives home tellingly the representative character of his subject in showing how Adam entered the world with a double bias—earthwards and heavenwards. Just as there strove within him two forces for the mastery, so in the dawning consciousness of every human being there are signs of a twofold parentage, the one from earth, the other from the breath of God. But he does not make as much use as he might of the full meaning of the impulse after beauty in the child stretching out its hand to grasp a bright object, to which Adam's cry as he looked upon the fruit: "It is good for food and pleasant to the eyes," corresponded.

The succeeding chapter on "Abel the Undeveloped" is a poetical and imaginative description of Abel's sacrifice looked upon as a germ-cell of the later sacrificial code of Israel, and the incipient first-fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross. His character, the type of undeveloped weakness, is well contrasted with that of Cain, a sturdy, matter-

of-fact, materialistic agriculturist. We note an allusion to original sin in the statement that "the sin of the Garden had become procreative," lacking in the former chapter where one would naturally look for it. Theology, however, is not Dr. Matheson's strong point. He is thoughtful, highly original, with a style that has all the features of poetry, but he does not let dogmatic, any more than historical or scientific, fact curb the exuberance of his imaginative fancy.

The next three chapters, dealing with Noah the Renewer, Abraham the Cosmopolitan, and Isaac the Domesticated, respectively, are the most superficial in the book. Yet there are suggestive thoughts in them here and there, as, for instance, the unobtrusiveness of Noe, whose name means "rest," and who was essentially "the quiet man" of a bustling age given over to gross materialism, and his optimism which made him hope up to the end that the people around him would repent. Again, the writer brings out well the analogy between the three first trials of Abraham and the temptations of Jesus, and he has an original exegesis of the statement in Hebrews that Christ "suffered outside the camp," which he takes to mean that "the trials of a captain are greater when unappreciated by his army," applying the idea to Isaac's long life of suffering in secret.

Of the remaining portraits,—Jacob the Aspiring, Joseph the Optimist, Moses the Practical, Joshua the Prosaic, Samuel the Seer, David the Many-sided, Solomon the Wise, Elijah the Impulsive, Elisha the Imitative, Job the Patient,—the first and the last please us best. There is shown in them keen insight into character, warm sympathy with human failings, much originality of thought, and fulness of expression. Dr. Matheson has the faculty of entering into the thoughts of his subjects. Jacob is to him a "mentally aspiring man," selfish only that he may reach the heights of unselfishness; Job is the personification of patience, never more so than in his bitter outcry when human sympathy is taken from him.

It does not need a foot-note to tell us that the volume is a *rechauffé* of various lectures. The form is homiletic throughout. The long rhapsodical prayers which end each chapter, although at times rising to real eloquence and always beautiful in diction, are altogether too formal, savor too strongly of the Presbyterian pulpit, for the Catholic who prefers the simplest spoken communings of the soul with God. But there are enough suggestive ideas, casting light more than once upon difficult passages in the Scriptures, to make the book useful, especially to priests contemplating a course of sermons on Old Testament characters.

Literary Chat.

Hodges, Figgis & Co., of Dublin, announce a new edition of Wakeman's "Handbook of Irish Antiquities," by John Cooke, Fellow of the Royal Society of Antiquaries, and well known as the editor of Murray's Handbook for Ireland.

Students interested in the question of Philippine culture and government will be glad to know that, through the medium of the Very Rev. Dr. Thomas C. Middleton, of the Augustinian Order at Villanova, there have been established at various intellectual centres in the United States repositories of useful works relating to the Philippines. Not only are such books to be found in the various Historical Societies, but the Library of Congress at Washington, the Public Libraries of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago, have also been supplied. Thus scholars are enabled to obtain accurate and just information on a subject greatly misunderstood, and hence largely misrepresented.

Dr. Middleton is, of all other men, in a position to point out the authorities to be studied, and also the works *not to be followed*, by scholars seeking to obtain light on Philippine matters. His researches, in connection with the Historical Society of Philadelphia, and more so with the Religious Order which was the first established in the Philippines, and which has been the most influential there for three centuries, give him special opportunities for explaining the situation. If our Catholic Federation should see its way to take up the matter under his counsel, there would be no danger of hot-headed advance, or of purely political partisanship.

Lady Gregory, author of *Cuchulain of Muirthemme*, has collected a number of choice studies and translations which are to be published under the title of "Poets and Dreamers."

A paper on Christian Science, its methods, progress, and the dangers which encompass its popularity, appears in the December issue of the *North American Review*. Although we are inclined to quarrel with the author, Mark Twain, because of his flippancy on other occasions in dealing with certain religious topics which are foreign to his study, it must be admitted that there are in the present instance very serious reflections bound up with his half ludicrous arraignment of Mrs. Eddy's methods of playing upon the weakness of human nature. Mr. Clement's cynical good humor furnishes really a most effective way of neutralizing the unthinking enthusiasm which the system of "Christian Science" is apt to engender among the credulous masses. What he stigmatizes recalls in truth the "abomination in the Holy Place" foretold by the Prophet.

Professor Emil Hirsch, of the University of Chicago, takes up the editorship of the Biblical Department in the new *Jewish Encyclopedia*. The first two volumes have been edited by Professor Morris Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania.

The third volume of the Rev. Dr. Breen's Exposition of the Four Gospels is announced. Published at St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester.

Cincinnati brings out a new popular magazine of good promise. Fifty Catholics have formed a stock company to launch the enterprise, and the first number of "*Men and Women*," a Catholic home Journal, published monthly, at one dollar per year, is full of interesting material, well illustrated. Among the contributors announced are most of the names familiar in Catholic magazine literature intended to entertain. The editor, Mr. S. A. Baldus, leads with a well-written chapter on Washington Irving, the first in a series of American Men of Letters. We trust the *motif*, which the editor seemingly assigns as the chief reason for the new enterprise, viz., the high price of the Catholic magazines in the field, is not a serious one. It may be true, as he says, that "the reading world has discovered long ago that a first-class magazine can be purchased for One Dollar," but that reading world is of a particular sort. As among our secular periodicals there are one-dollar magazines and five-dollar magazines having their respective clientele, so with Catholic magazines. The fact that the large mass of our Catholic population belongs to the poor and middle class may sufficiently account for the hope that a cheap magazine such as *Men and Women* promises to be, will reach a large circulation ; and it also furnishes the reason why the magazines which exclusively appeal to a different class must have a limited patronage. A really good Catholic magazine can not, however, do what the secular magazines do in the way of indiscriminate advertising, without at once lowering its standard, and that is a point not to be left out of sight—even by such enterprising business syndicates as "The Men and Women Publishing Company." We hope their success in gaining the confidence of the reading-world by presenting first-class literary matter of a thoroughly Catholic tone and without truckling to personalities or serving party spirit, may in the future keep the managers from the temptation of permitting displays that suggest the very evils which the writers of such a magazine are supposed to combat. That is the thought which remained uppermost in our mind after looking over this first number of the new magazine, cover and all.

The Hon. James Bryce, author of "The American Commonwealth," has collected a number of biographical sketches, containing estimates of Dean Stanley, Gladstone, Cardinal Manning, Lord Acton, and other men of recent English society. To be published by the Macmillans.

The first volume of the projected "Cambridge Modern History" course has just appeared. It takes up the Renaissance period. The remaining eleven volumes will deal with the Reformation—the Wars of Religions—the Thirty Years' War—Bourbons and Stuarts—the Eighteenth Century—the United States—the French Revolution—Napoleon—Restoration and Reaction—the Growth of Nationalities—the Latest Age. Lord Acton, with whom, as Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, the series originated, though a Catholic, was known to be of extremely liberal tendencies. Mr. Lilly, in his recent historical survey of the Reformation period, leaves the impression that he reflects most faithfully Lord Acton's particular bias. Hence some estimate of the tendency of the Cambridge History series may be formed from Mr. Lilly's work.

Mr. Magnus Maclean's History of Celtic Literature promises to be a valuable as well as interesting contribution to the already important store of Celtic studies with which the recent revival has made us familiar. It deals in detail, not only with the cultivation of letters in Ireland, but with the very wide influence which Celtic teachers and writers exercised upon English and Continental scholarship. Scottish, Welsh, and Breton relics of poetry and fact, incorporated in the great books of Saga, are treated with literary judgment and skill, if we may form an estimate from the publishers' (Blackie & Son, London) prospectus.

The *Independent*, speaking of "Ecclesiastical Rebellion in the Philippines," headed by a disgruntled native priest, discriminatingly remarks that "the character of those prominent in this movement is such as to discredit it."

Professor Harnack's volume on the mission and extension of the Christian religion during the first three centuries has just reached us (Hinrich, Leipzig). We notice cursorily that he discredits the canons of the Apostolic Council of Antioch mentioned by Innocent I. It may be with these canons as it is with the legislative forms of the Mosaic Pentateuch. They received their present form of expression in subsequent revisions of the original, together with such modifications as were required for practical application at a later time. But this does not the less make them the acts of the former age. We know from the statements of St. Luke (Acts 11 : 22) and of St. Paul (Galat. 2 : 11) that there was a convention of the heads of the Church at Antioch immediately after the Council in Jerusalem (A. D. 51), and that an important decision was there promulgated regarding the attitude of the Pagan converts toward the old Mosaic observances. That is precisely the burden of the nine canons referred to as the legislation of the Synod of Antioch; and the form in which Innocent I (elected A. D. 402) refers to it in his letter to Alexander, the Bishop of Antioch, might well be regarded as a purely accidental modification which affects the substantial origin of the document no more than the divisions into chapters and verses found in modern Bibles affect the genuine character of the Sacred Writings.

The Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language has issued its first number of essays as the result of Father MacTernan's legacy. It is from the pen of Father P. S. Dinneen. These sketches have the English translations on opposite pages, with a reference list of Irish words at the end of the volume.

Charles E. Peabody Co., of Boston, which has recently purchased *The Literary Review* and all copyrights of books belonging formerly to Richard Badger & Co., has recently issued a new edition of *Sliav-na-mon's* (Father James B. Dollard) "Irish Mist and Sunshine."

A remarkable brochure, entitled *L'estetica dell'occhio umano in Dante Alighieri* (150 pages) recently appeared from the pen of Nicola Rillo. In it the learned Neapolitan traces the psychical power exercised by the human eye, and the scholastic doctrine making that organ the mirror of the soul, as illustrated in the writings of Dante—the eye of Beatrice, those of the Angels, of Comtess Matilda in the *Purgatorio*, finally of Francesca da Rimini, Ugolino, Lucifer. It is an interesting study both from the philosophical and the literary point of view, and sure to please readers of the Italian Dante.

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

MISSALE ROMANUM. Ex Decreto Sacros. Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii V Pont. Max. jussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII, et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Editio Tertia post alteram Typicam. Cum. Approb. S. Rit. Congr. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Sumpt. et Typis Friderici Pustet. S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rit. Congr. Typogr. MDCCCCIII. Price, $1.85.

DE DEO UNO ET TRINO. Disputationes Theologicae in Iam Partem D. Thomae Qu. II—XLIII. Auctore Josepho M. Picirelli, S.J. Neapoli: Typis Michaelis D'Auria. MCMII. Pp. 1418.

APOLOGIE DES CHRISTENTHUMS. Von Dr. Herman Schell, Prof. Univ. Würzburg. Bd. I. Religion und Offenbarung. Second Edit. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh. 1902. Pp. 482.

COMMENTARIUS IN LIBRUM JOSUE. Auctore Francisco de Hummelauer, S.J. (Cursus S. Scripturae.) Parisiis: Sumpt. P. Lethielleux. 1903. Pp. 531.

ARA COELI, oder Die Sibylle des Augustus. Eine mittelalterliche Legende von Anton de Waal. Rome, 1902. Pp. 89.

THE TRUTH—MIXED MARRIAGE. By Rev. Charles Coppens. Chicago: Catholic Truth Society, 562 Harrison St. Series I, No. 15. Pp. 30. Price: one cent.

HISTOIRE DES LIVRES DE NOUVEAU TESTAMENT. Par E. Jacquier. Vol. I. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre. 1903. Pp. 490.

MANUALE LITURGICUM juxta novissimam Rubricarum reformationem et recentissima SS. Rituum Congregationis Decreta. Cura et studio P. Victorii ab Appeltern, Ord. Frat. Min. Cap. Pars I De Rubricis Missalis Romani. Pars II De Rubricis Breviarii Romani. Pp. 594 et 253. Malines: H. Dierickx-Beke Fils.

THE MIRROR OF PERFECTION. Being a Record of Saint Francis, of Assisi, ascribed to his companion, Brother Leo of Assisi. Now translated by Constance, Countess de la War. With an Introduction by Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. London: Burns & Oates. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 185. Price, $1.35.

THE YOUNG CHRISTIAN TEACHER ENCOURAGED, or Objections to Teaching answered. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. John L. Spalding, D.D., Bishop of Peoria, Ill. By B. C. G. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Pp. 381. Price, $1.25.

THE HOLY GHOST AND THE HOLY EUCHARIST. By Rev. A. A. Lambing, LL.D., Pp. 30. Price, $0.10.

APHORISMI EUCHARISTICI. Id est Piae et Sanctae Celebrationis Monita ex praecipuis ascetis collecta et illustrata opera Jacobi Merlo-Horstii. Textum recensuit adjectis precibus, denuo edidit Jos. Aloisius Krebs, C. SS. R. Cum Vita et effigie auctoris. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Frideric. Pustet. MDCCCCII. Pag. 158. Price, $0.60.

A SHORT RULE AND DAILY EXERCISE for a Beginner in the Spiritual Life. By Ludovicus Blosius, O.S.B. Translated by Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. MCMII. Pp. 63. Price, $0.20.

COMFORT FOR THE FAINT-HEARTED. By Ludovicus Blosius, O.S.B. Translated from the Latin by Bertrand Wilberforce, O.P. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. MCMII. Pp. 178. Price, $0.75.

OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCES. Second Series, 1900—1901. By Joseph Rickaby, S.T. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 246. Price, $1.35.

LETTERS TO YOUNG MEN. By Henry Dominique Lacordaire, O.P. Translated from the French. New Edition, revised and enlarged. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1902. Pp. 236. Price, $0.75.

THE RELIGIOUS STATE. The Episcopate and the Priestly Office. By Thomas Aquinas. A Translation of the minor work of the Saint on the Perfection of the Spiritual Life. Edited with Preface by Very Rev. Fr. Proctor, S.T.M. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 166. Price, $1.00.

ONWARD AND UPWARD. A Year Book compiled from the Discourses of Archbishop Keane. By Maurice Francis Egan. Baltimore and New York: John Murphy Company. Pp. 387.

ADDRESS OF THE RT. REV. WILLIAM H. O'CONNELL, D.D., Bishop of Portland, Maine, to the Graduating Class of Boston College, June 18, 1902. Pp. 24.

PROGRAMME DES COURS DE L'UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN. Anné Academique 1902–1903. Louvain: Typogr. Jos. Van Linthout, imprimeur de l'Université. 1902. Pp. 98.

A COMPLETE CALENDAR OF THE ENGLISH SAINTS AND MARTYRS for every day of the year. Compiled by William Canon Fleming, Rector of St. Mary's, Moorfields. London: Sands & Co. 1902. Pp. 120.

MARTIN LUTHER. Von Julius Köstlin, Prof. Univ. Halle. Fünfte Auflage, fortgesetzt von Gustav Kawerau, Prof. Univ. Breslau. Berlin und New York: Alexander Duncker. 1902. Pp. 80.

BELLES-LETTRES.

A MARTYR OF THE VALLEY, AND OTHER POEMS. By P. J. Coleman. New York: The Messenger Press. Pp. 132. Price, $1.

FIVE OF DIAMONDS. By Mrs. Guthrie. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co. 1902. 12mo. Pp. 456. Price, retail, $1; *net* $0.50.

DEUTSCHE WEISEN AUS AMERIKA. Ein Buch von Liedern und Geschichten. Von Georg Schoener. Mit Porträt. Pittsburg. 1895. Pp. 192.

IRISH MIST AND SUNSHINE. Ballads and Lyrics by Rev. James B. Dollard (Sliav-na-mon). With an Introduction by William O'Brien, M.P. Boston, Mass.: Charles E. Peabody Co. (Toronto, Canada: W. E. Blake.) 1902. Pp. 143.

SHADOWS OF AN IDEAL. By Emily R. Logue. Philadelphia, Pa.: Peter Reilly. 1902. Price, $0.40.

FATHER TOM OF CONNEMARA. By Elizabeth O'Reilly Neville. Illustrated. Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally & Co. 1902. Pp. 394. Price, $1.50.

MISCELLANEOUS.

CONSTRUCTIVE AND PREVENTIVE PHILANTHROPY. By Joseph Lee, Vice-President of the Massachusetts Civic League. With Introduction by Jacob A. Riis. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co. 1902. Pp. 242.

THE SATIRE OF SENECA ON THE APOTHEOSIS OF CLAUDIUS. Commonly called ΑΠΟΚΟΛΟΚΥΝΤΩΣΙΣ. A study by Allan Perley Ball. New York: The Columbia University Press. The Macmillan Company, Agents. 1902. Pp. vii—526. Price, $1.25 *net*.

EASY AND NATURAL METHOD OF SIGHT SINGING. For Self-Instruction and Class Use. By W. P. Schilling, Organist and Choir Master of St. Peter's Cathedral, Scranton, Pa. Published by W. P. Schilling, Scranton, Pa. Pp. 76.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—FEBRUARY, 1903.—NO. 2.

THE NAME OF THE CHURCH.

THERE are two sufficient reasons for discussing at present the name of the Church. The first is that many Catholics of influence do not realize the importance of a "form of sound words" in speaking of the Church. The whole power of the State is at the service of a commercial company in protecting its right to the exclusive use of its own name; but the Church has no such protection. On the contrary, State influence in English-speaking countries acts powerfully in the direction of imposing on the Church a name which the Church has authoritatively rejected. And this is not a matter that Catholics can afford to ignore. The name of the Church is of vital importance. It is not possible that a trivial matter could elicit one of the warmest debates that took place in the Vatican Council, and the name of the Church was the subject of such a debate. The Bishops insisted that nothing should be done to obscure our exclusive claim to this name—*The Catholic Church.* For this reason they refused to allow the Church to be called the *Roman Catholic Church.* One of the arguments used by them may be thus stated:

In the biography of Ambrose de Lisle we are told that the seed of his subsequent conversion was sown in his boyhood when reciting those words of the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church." The thoughts of thousands or even millions of Protestant children are directed to the Catholic Church by those words of the Creed. The interest which they manifest in the Catholic Church in after years very often

dates from their first acquaintance with the Creed. The more strictly we keep to the original name of the Church in our every-day speaking and writing, the more forcibly will the Apostles' Creed draw Protestants back to the Church. The force of this attraction is so great that in Catholic countries, where the expression "Roman Catholic Church" is never heard in daily life, Protestant missionaries are often forced to ignore the Apostles' Creed altogether. How can they teach their people to believe in the holy Catholic Church when the language of daily life about them identifies the Church of the Apostles' Creed with the Church in communion with the Pope? In English-speaking countries the difficulty is evaded by their habit of calling the Church the Roman Catholic Church, and Catholics who imitate them in this habit unconsciously help to turn the thoughts of Protestants away from the Church.

This is one of several reasons which induced the Vatican Council to reject "Roman Catholic" in discussing the form of words to be used. It is as far as possible from being a matter of small importance.

The second reason for discussing the name of the Church is that in English-speaking countries at least there is in fact a good deal of confusion in our practice, if not in our minds. The Reformation succeeded in forcing upon us the use of two words. In his Anglican days Newman was able thus to retort upon Catholics:

"If Romanists among us still taunt us with our present loss of the name Catholic, as far as the world's witness goes, then we take leave to remind them that if we have let slip 'Catholic,' at least we have kept 'Church,' which in this country they have not; and thus we have a popular witness in our favor as well as they. It is a common reproach of theirs against us, that if we were to take St. Cyril's test, and ask in the street for the 'Catholic' place of worship, no one would dream of directing us to any but theirs. Now it has been retorted, truly and happily, that in like manner if they ask for the 'Church,' they will be directed to none other than ours. We go to *church*, and they to *chapel*."

Seventy-five years ago this was a good controversial retort. They had succeeded in forcing upon our forefathers the humble word *chapel*. Nowadays the retort would have neither point nor

meaning, because we have vindicated our right to the use of the word "church," and we have regained that right by force of our own daily practice in using correctly the word "church." The other word forced into daily use by the Reformation is the word "Roman," and in this case there is still much to be done before we get back to a correct use of the word. Like "chapel," it has a legitimate place in the vocabulary of the Church. It is useful in a description of the Church, because it suggests the monarchical form of government, and it indicates the central seat of government. This use of it does not date from the Reformation, and no one has a right to object when it is used as a descriptive word. What dates from the Reformation is the use of the word as part of the everyday name of the Church, as if "Roman Catholic Church" were her distinctive name. The momentum of past usage partly accounts for the continued use among Catholics of this modification of the name given in the Creed, but only partly. It has to be confessed that another influence has worked in the same direction. Let us suppose that a Catholic traveller visits the University of Oxford. He meets Dr. Fairbairn, and after some conversation he remarks to the Doctor:

"Some time ago you published a book, whose title struck me as somewhat odd. It is called *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican.* To me Catholicism is something unique and not susceptible of division into different kinds."

"Allow me," replies the Doctor, "to call your attention to the fact that another book was published about the same time in Rome by a Professor of Theology, Father Billot, with the title: *Proof of the Truth of the Roman Catholic Church.* You see he justifies me in my use of the word 'Roman'."

"Yes; but he does not justify you in your use of the word 'Anglican'."

"I beg your pardon; he does. Words are not private property. We must take them in the generally received sense. Now, I call two perfectly competent witnesses to testify to the force of the word 'Roman' as used by Father Billot, namely, Doctor Lingard and Cardinal Newman. Lingard says:

"'If we refuse to adopt the appellation *Roman Catholic*, the reason is, because it imports what is irreconcilable with our prin-

ciples, that churches which have separated from the ancient Catholic Church may still have a right to the title of Catholic.' According to Lingard, therefore, Father Billot gives me the right to use 'Anglican' by his use of 'Roman.' And Newman tells us in his *Apologia* that in writing his work on Development his difficulties so cleared away that he ceased to speak of 'Roman Catholics,' and boldly called them Catholics. That is, as he understood it, the word 'Roman' restricts the word 'Catholic,' when the two are united."

"You have made out a strong case, I admit," says the visitor; "but I think I see a way out. I hold with Lingard that the word 'Roman' is out of place in the name of the Church. In fact the Vatican Council has by implication so decided; but the Council also decided that the word may be used in describing the Church, and it must be merely as a descriptive word that Father Billot uses it."

"A name is one thing and a description is another; but this distinction does not hold in the case under discussion. Would you expect a description of the Church in the title or the subtitle of a work on the Church? Anyhow, Father Billot says expressly in the body of the work that the word 'Roman' is added to the very name of the Church; and if, as you say, the Council decided against that, then his is not an example of obedience."

The visitor goes away with the impression that he has been beaten in argument without being convinced in reason. The question for us is: what is at the bottom of it all? A comparison will help to understand. For many years the rulers of France have acted as if they wished to change the name of their country. In their zeal for the republican form of government, they have put upon coins, on postage stamps, and on all official documents, not the name of the country, as is done elsewhere, but *République Française*. It is a weak policy. It would be more becoming a great country to assume, and to act on the assumption, that the form of government is beyond question. The glorious name of France should not be obscured by the desire to give prominence to her form of government. Something similar has happened in the Church. Many theologians, in their zeal for the monarchical form of government in the Church, have acted as if they wished

to change the name of the Church. They seem to imagine that they score a point in favor of the monarchical form by inserting the word 'Roman' in the name of the Church. Perrone goes to the verge of heterodoxy in this direction when he says:

"In the same way as in former times the Church, which was called Christian, had to be called Catholic to distinguish her from sects which also called themselves Christian, so when later heretics and schismatics began to call themselves Orthodox and Catholic, the Church had to be called also *Roman* in order to distinguish her from the sects which usurped the former name."

This teaching may be policy, but it is neither history nor theology. It implies that the Church is not sufficiently designated by the title of Catholic Church. It implies that bodies which separate from the Catholic Church have as much right to retain the title of Catholic as that of Christian. It implies other things equally unfounded; but it is as a policy that it is here considered. The French politicians can at least say for themselves that it is the business of politicians to have a policy and to act on it; but theological professors are beyond their sphere of labor when they meddle with matters of policy. Their subject-matter is a science. They are out of touch with the world of action. To the Bishops belongs the divine right of dealing with matters of policy. These two elements of the Church came into conflict in the Vatican Council over the name of the Church, and the Bishops decided that the ancient name, the name in the Creed, should not be modified.

The Church has never once recognized or admitted "Roman Catholic Church" as her name. On the contrary, whenever the subject has been discussed, and it has been authoritatively discussed, the decision has always been that the name is the Catholic Church, without addition or modification. The conference between the Catholic and the Donatist Bishops at Carthage in 411 is peculiarly instructive. The former naturally spoke of themselves as the Catholics. To this the Donatist Bishops objected with vigor, and a long discussion ensued. The Donatists argued that the question as to who had a right to the Catholic name was a question of doctrine, and that every true Christian had a right to be called Catholic. St. Augustine and the other

Catholic Bishops argued, on the contrary, that it was a question of fact, not of doctrine. They urged unanswerably that the existence of an international Church, a Church embracing the *orbis terrarum*, was a visible fact; that the separation of the Donatists from this Church was a fact equally visible; and that these two facts determined the question of Catholicity, since *Catholic* means that the Church is not confined to one people, but embraces in the unity of organization every variety of people and nation. This is a never failing test. There is only one Church organically independent of national boundaries. Put it in the form of a school question: Name a Church which embraces most of the people in two large and independent nations, and is at the same time organically one Church. There is only one, and it is for that reason called the Catholic Church. By embracing two such nations she manifests the power to embrace all. By their inability to embrace even two such nations, all other churches show that they can never claim to be Catholic. The problem is this: how to throw a network of ecclesiastical organization over two or more independent nations without its breaking along the lines of national cleavage. There is only one Church on earth able to do it, and therefore there can never come the need of changing the name of the Catholic Church. There does not exist one Greek Church for all who call themselves the Orthodox Greeks. There are as many independent Greek Churches as there are independent nations of that faith. Anglicans strive to revive the Donatist test of Catholicity and make it a question of doctrine. Thus, Canon Dixon, in his *History of the Church of England*, says: "The opposite of Catholic is not Protestant but herectic; the opposite of Protestant is not Catholic but Papist." Father Tyrrell, S.J., aptly says in his *Faith of the Millions:* "Another point of misunderstanding which hides the face of the Church from intelligent outsiders concerns her Catholicity and independence of national and racial limitations. It is from this she derives her name of Catholic, *i.e.*, the Church of humanity, as opposed to the Church of the Jews." This is the original and genuine meaning of the word Catholic. The opposite of Catholic is national or racial. It is only in an indirect way that heretic becomes the opposite of Catholic, namely, as opposed to the

teaching of the Church *called* Catholic. The word Catholic has two different functions. It expresses an attribute of the Church and it is the name of the Church. As expressing an attribute its opposite is national, but as the name of the Church its opposite is everything opposed to the Church so named. Now, the question whether a given institution is national or merely local or international in its organization is a very simple question of fact, and there is superhuman wisdom in the embodying of so visible and so effective a test of truth in the very name of the Church. One who studies the question from the point of view of the real interests of the Church needs to be on his guard against feelings of anger against those who try to modify and obscure that name as it stands in the Apostles' Creed,—their attempt is so uncalled for, and so clearly a case of grasping at the shadow and letting go the substance. There is no dispute among Catholics about the form of government in the Church; but the face of the Church is in fact obscured to many outside by the custom of calling the Catholic Church by the unauthorized name, the "Roman Catholic Church." The Century Dictionary says that the name Catholic Church is often qualified by prefixing the word *Roman*, "especially by those not acknowledging" the claims of the Church. It would be a great gain if we could truthfully say that the word "especially" should be omitted by the Century. The weight of Catholic practice would then make it as impossible for Episcopalians or Anglicans as it was for the Donatists to appropriate the Catholic name.

Twice during the nineteenth century the question of the name of the Church came up for authoritative decision, and in both cases the decision was that the ancient name should not be qualified by any prefix. At the Congress of the Powers of Europe, held in Vienna, in 1815, one or more of the representatives spoke of the Catholic Church as "Roman Catholic Church." Against this title Cardinal Consalvi, as representative of the Pope, protested. He said that the Church is Roman as well as Catholic, but that the joint use of the two words as the name of the Church could not be admitted. In the Vatican Council the same question presented itself in an indirect way. The first chapter of the Constitution *de fide*, as it came from the Theological Commission, began thus:

"The holy Roman Catholic Church believes and professes that there is one true and living God, etc."

Here there is no direct question of the name of the Church. If the Constitution had been adopted in the proposed form, it would still be open to us to argue that the word "Roman," as well as the word "holy," was put there simply as a descriptive word, and that the name of the Church still remained in its unchanged ancient form of Catholic Church. But the Bishops decided that no risks should be taken in so important a matter as the official name of the Church. They felt that if the proposed form were adopted, many would understand it to mean the adoption of a modified name for the Church; and, after a warm debate, the form was so changed as to make it impossible for anyone to infer therefrom that the name of the Church is other than this: *The Catholic Church.* For there is only one disputed question regarding the name of the Church. Is the word "Roman" a part of that name? The Council decided that it is not, and hence rejected the form "Roman Catholic Church." Then came the question: Is the word "Roman" a proper descriptive word to be used like the word "Apostolic" in speaking of the Church? To this the Council answered in the affirmative. Some curious facts were brought to light in the course of the discussion. One Bishop told of a Catholic in his diocese who had bequeathed some property in his will to the Catholic Church. The Episcopalians applied to the civil courts and obtained possession of the property on the ground that it was not bequeathed to the "Roman Catholic Church," but to that body which the law rccognizes as the Catholic Church of England.[1] The Bishop asked the Vatican Council not to sanction this anti-Catholic assumption of British law. Another told of a long contest he had with the government of a British colony, because the government refused to receive his letters unless they were signed by him as *Roman Catholic Bishop*, and not simply as *Catholic Bishop.* He asked the Council not to oblige him to yield in such contests. And the Council decided not merely that the Church should not

[1] "That body (the Church of England) is supposed by the law of the country to be the ancient and Catholic Church of the country, as well as the national establishment of Religion."—Hon. W. E. Gladstone in *Contemporary Review*, 1875.

be called the Roman Catholic Church, but that not even a pretext should be given for that appellation. There is no express prohibition, but the action of the Council is an implied prohibition, to call the Church by any other name than that given to her in the Apostles' Creed. For, after all, who has the right to modify the name of the Church? Neither Protestant governments nor the Catholics of one or two countries, nor college professors, have that right. To none but the Church herself should we look for guidance in this case. Now the Church has never, in all the centuries of her existence, accepted or sanctioned any other name than that given in the Creed, and, when urged to adopt what might be taken for a modified name, she refused. We have no right to call ourselves Roman Catholics, because this name does not correspond with the name which the Church has given to herself, and because we thereby suggest that there are different kinds of Catholics. Some have attempted to counteract this implication that there are different kinds of Catholics by explaining that "Catholic" and "Roman Catholic" have the same meaning. They might as well attempt to keep away the winter season by furnaces in the open air. When the majority of those who use the name "Roman Catholic" attach a restrictive meaning to the word "Roman," and when adjectives are by their very nature suggestive of restriction, how can an occasional explanation prevent serious misunderstanding? Far better frankly to confess that as we needed reform in the case of the word "chapel," so we now need to reform our use of "Roman Catholic." Some of our prayer-books and catechisms persist in giving to the Church of Christ a name which the Church has refused to accept. But then, it will still be asked, do not some of our best theologians also give the Church that name? Yes, they do sometimes; but when choice has to be made between theologians and the Church, there should be no difficulty in making the choice. It is not a case of conflict in teaching. It is a case that may be expected to occur occasionally by reason of the complex nature of the Church. The Church has not merely the office of teaching; she has also that of ruling. The teaching and the ruling functions are carried on side by side, and they act and react upon each other. Theologians minister to the teaching office. Sometimes they are

restrained in their scientific exposition of revealed truth by the ruling power in the interest of humble souls, because apparent "novelty is often error to those who are unprepared for it, from the refraction with which it enters into their conceptions." Sometimes, on the other hand, theologians encroach on the ruling office, as in this case, of giving a name to the Church. To select a name belongs primarily to the ruling office. It is an act of government. This ebb and flow of the powers within the Church is a slow movement, unless there come a crisis requiring strong action, and another half century may yet elapse before theologians thoroughly realize that to modify the name of the Church does not lie within their sphere of duty.

The theologians of to-day do not seem to know what really took place in the Council during the discussion on this subject. The published *Decreta* do not show on their face that any question regarding the name of the Church was raised. The only published account of it seems to be that of Father Granderath, and if this is correctly represented by Father Hughes in the September number of this REVIEW, theologians have not yet the means of knowing what took place. The gist of it, in the words of Father Hughes, is, "that in Solemn Public Sessions and by Papal confirmation the *name* 'Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church' became an official designation of the Church of God, approved and sanctioned by supreme authority." This is not the truth. The word "Apostolic" was inserted and the word "Roman" was transposed for the very purpose of avoiding even the appearance of giving the distinctive name or official designation of the Church, and for the purpose of giving, as other Councils had given, an authentic description of the Church. No theologian would dream of maintaining that in solemn session of the Second Œcumenical Council, and by Papal confirmation, the *name* "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" became an official designation of the Church. It is not a name; it is a description. The Fathers of the fourth century tell us in a hundred different ways that the name of the Church is simply the Catholic Church, which they could not have done if the Second Council had intended to give, not the features, but the name of the Church. It would indeed be rather awkward to have to call

ourselves "Holy Catholic Apostolic Romanists," and that is what we should have to submit to, if Father Hughes' statement were correct. As the people of France are called Frenchmen, and the people of Germany Germans, so the people of the Christian Republic must be designated by its name. The contention in the Vatican Council about the insertion of a comma or the word *and* between "Roman" and "Catholic" meant that there was, on the one side, the purpose of obtaining indirectly official recognition of "Roman Catholic" as a name, and, on the other side, a fixed determination to defeat that purpose. It is too late in the day to contend now that after all the defeat was a victory. The name of the Church is now what it has ever been since the time of the Apostles—the Catholic Church.

When Colonies in America called themselves collectively New England, there was no need of England adopting some other prefix. If another part of the world called itself Little England, and if Australia had called itself Grand England, there would still be no call upon England to apply to Parliament for a prefix. The simple title of England marks her off as the original possessor of the name, and her use of a prefix would only obscure her claim to that position. All others using the name are forced to adopt prefixes. So is it with the Catholic Church. She is the original possessor of the name. The simple title of Catholic Church, recognized by the whole world, witnesses to her claim to be the original possessor. All others, if they use the name at all, are forced to adopt prefixes, such as Old Catholic, Anglo-Catholic, Greek Catholic, Reformed Catholic, etc. It does not matter how many there are of them, if only we have the good sense to avoid the prefix habit. There is no call upon us to place ourselves among the prefixed. It were folly on our part to abandon or obscure our position of preëminence for the sake of any prefix, however honorable that prefix is in itself. No sect or schism has ever dared, or will ever dare, call itself simply the Catholic Church; but some future sect or schism, originating in Italy, may possibly call itself Roman Catholic.

PROPAGANDIST.

"SCHOLASTICISM AND THE MODERN METHOD."

SOME of us who have gone through a course of philosophy in preparation for the priesthood can recall the weary hours we passed during the first years of our acquaintance with Scholasticism. It was hard to find anything to catch our imagination, or fix our attention. The daily torture of thrusting or parrying peripatetic problems which we felt sure our intellectual father Aristotle would have disowned, in Latin which we felt sure our literary father Cicero would have anathematized, was only borne in the hope that some day we should find these studies a help in the great work of winning souls. Yet it was a heavy task to pore over tomes printed abroad, and printed, as we told ourselves, so abominably, with heavy type welded together into interminable paragraphs. We began to look back to our dainty copies of Homer or Horace with their clear type, and their apt notes, not over-learned, but just sufficiently steeped in classical lore to bring the poet into living contact with our souls. We missed the clearly-drawn and gently-toned maps—the full indices, the air of modernity of our histories and geographies, which we grew, alas! to regret when it was too late. Soon we began to ask ourselves, could any social or religious good come of such intellectual jargon as *Barbara, Celarent*?—what was the precise social momentum of a Sorites?—how could the conversion of our fatherland be furthered by a more profound knowledge of *Ens Rationis?*—what were the occult relations between Transcendentalism, say, and the sweating system?—until our mind grew sick within us at the thought of squandering the precious years of life in a quixotic wandering after intellectual will-o'-the-wisps.

No doubt such a period of acute emotion is likely to come and go; come, on the first acquaintance with the deeper philosophic studies; and go, when it is at last clear that to have dug deep down in mental darkness and solitude to the lower strata of first principles is to have advanced the Kingdom of God's Truth on earth.

But a further thought sprang up to take the place of the banished doubt, and grew at length to a difficulty. It was not philosophic teaching with its accompanying abstraction that

appeared fatuous and useless. It was that form of philosophic thought to which our minds were being bent. Our difficulty was not philosophy, but Scholasticism. No doubt this further difficulty would have had its ebb and flow in a natural day, had our minds been allowed to rest. But we were confronted by a solid phalanx of non-Catholic thinkers who ignored Scholasticism, and by a determined band of Catholic apologists, who somewhat timidly defended it. At last our minds wavered before the thoughts from within and suggestions from without, and we somewhat anxiously asked ourselves if there was any truth in the oft-spoken thesis: "Scholasticism must give way to the Modern Method."

To encourage discussion let me set down the results of my own thoughts on this thesis.

I note that the formulator of such a thesis must have found the solution of well-nigh unfathomable difficulties. For, to my mind, it is well-nigh impossible to define what is "Scholasticism," and what the "Modern Method." Now to attempt the defence of a thesis without boundary, mere position without magnitude, is the hope of a bold, perhaps a foolhardy man. And to consider that the subject and predicate of the above thesis can be circumscribed by any satisfactory definition would suggest the proofs or the suspicion that the writer had made up his mind after an easy off-hand glance at a thorny philosophical problem.

To justify these severe criticisms, let us begin by asking ourselves: "What is Scholasticism?" Before we can hope for an answer we must go on to ask: "Who are Scholastics?" It would be useless to write on Feudalism if we made no effort to determine with whom it began and with whom it ended. Yet how difficult it is to say who are scholastics and who are not. Shall we hold the father of Scholasticism to be Peter Lombard, or Hugh of St. Victor, or St. Anselm, or St. John Damascene, or St. Augustine? Did Scholasticism appear merely as a phenomenon of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries? Or does it extend from Boethius in the sixth to Billuart in the eighteenth.

But it would be even a harder task to describe it logically than to circumscribe it chronologically. Its logical content defies identification, as it has defied localization.

Is it a method or a system, or both?

Or is it a literary manner? Is it didascalic or coördinative? Is it practical (μέθοδος), or speculative (σύστημα), or neither, or both?

If Scholasticism is a system, as Platonism and Aristotelianism are held to be systems, then it may be asked, how it contrives to shelter such divergent thinkers as Erigena, Abelard, Aquinas, and Scotus. If we venture to reply that Scholasticism is identical with Thomism, we shall be forced to find a new name for the followers of Scotus, Bonaventure, and Suarez. If we make bold to say that Scholasticism is nothing more than Aristotelianism conditionally baptized, or merely named afresh on its reception into the Church, what name shall be given to the Platonism of Abelard and the Nominalism of William of Occam? Is Scholasticism but another name for Thomism, Bonaventurism, Scotism? Is it Realism, or Nominalism, or Conceptualism, or all three, or none? Thus if we hold it to be a system, we cannot shirk the baffling enquiry, "Which system? Thomism, Scotism, etc.?" And if it is a system, what are its principles? since a system is knowledge of abstract or concrete facts arranged and organized by the light of a principle or principles. Can we maintain historically or logically that Scholasticism is Hylomorphism or Creationism or any other abstract view of Being? All these necessary questions lead us to suspect that our term Scholasticism, at first sight so clear and apparently definable, holds more than we bargained for, and that far from being a fixed system which finds itself antagonistic to modern philosophic thought, it had already been a pioneer of the moderns in every field of truth and heresy.

On the other hand it would seem easier to concede that Scholasticism was a method rather than a system. The influential men of the thirteenth century, the golden age of Scholasticism, were *Doctores*, *i. e.*, teachers rather than thinkers. Their influence lay in their power of summary and their clearness of exposition. They were unapproachable in their successful compilation of text-books. Their highest academic honor was that of Master. And it is the master rather than the discoverer, the teacher rather than the thinker who can write a successful text-book. I am not denying that many of the scholastics of the thirteenth century were true, earnest, and successful thinkers. To concede this is to bear out my contention

that Scholasticism well-nigh defies identification. But, for the sake of argument, I would urge that, on the whole, its professors in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were teachers imparting organized knowledge through a method, rather than thinkers discovering and organizing knowledge into a system. Yet here again we are perplexed by the recurrence of the question, "Which method?" Is it that of Alcuin, or William of Champeaux, or Bonaventure, or Aquinas, or Capreolus, or Cajetan, or Suarez, or Billuart? If we sometimes read in certain well-meaning but hardly well-informed histories of philosophy that Scholasticism diverges from the modern method by being deductive rather than inductive, we are staggered by the empiric earnestness and accuracy displayed by such a classical scholastic as St. Thomas. Students who wish to refresh their inductive, at the same time as their deductive faculties, might be safely introduced to the Anthropology of the *Summa.* A Thomist can never cease to wonder how it can be said that the *Secunda Secundae* is merely deductive, or even dominantly so. It is deduction pure and simple, or rather is it not a brilliant exercise of induction, and its associate, deduction, to find out and organize the marvellous ethics of Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance? Are the Angelic Doctor's subtle searchings into the human heart, its pathology and therapeutics, but a lifeless conclusion from a barren principle? Perhaps the nearest approach to a logical definition of Scholasticism is this: "The scientific attempt to adjust and justify the relations of Faith and Reason, of Natural Knowledge and Supernatural Revelation." Yet if this definition be accepted, Scholasticism must include St. Augustine and St. Irenæus—nay, more, it cannot close the door upon St. Paul discoursing to the Corinthians on the immortality of the body, and St. John reconciling the Incarnation with the Platonic Λογος. Moreover, in case this definition be accepted as a working hypothesis, what becomes of the thesis that Scholasticism must give way to the modern method? Whatever may, or may not, be included under the term "modern method," it is suicidal of Christians to expect that it will finally show the hopelessness of harmonizing the truths that come from God through reason with those that come from God through Revelation.

There would little profit it putting forward the view that Scholasticism, if neither a system nor a method, is, at any rate, a literary manner. The *Stabat Mater* and *Dies Irae* are equally children of Scholasticism with the *Cur Deus Homo* or the *Summa Contra Gentiles.* Moreover, why should the modern mind consider that literary atmosphere to be dampening which has vibrated to every note of literature, from the flawless legal preciseness and personless accuracy of the *Summa* to the rhapsodies of Bernard and Bonaventure?

In answer to all this it may be argued that Scholasticism is not a definite metaphysical, logical, or literary school, but a definite spirit, and that though we may not know its boundaries, we can tell its existence. But will it then be true to say that Scholasticism is wholly hostile to whatever is true and advantageous in the modern method? If the Scholasticism of St. Thomas sought to know and employed all that was true and advantageous in the science of its day, shall we conclude that there must be war to the bitter end between Scholasticism and modern thought, and that no *modus vivendi* can be found between two such powerful forces for good or evil? Surely all this is puzzling enough.

Yet we have not determined what is meant by the modern method, the predicate of our thesis. Here our difficulties thicken rather than diminish. Do we mean the modern philosophic method? And if so, what do we mean by modern? Will Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* be considered too ancient, and Lepidi's *Philosophia* too recent? Must we include such irreconcilables as Descartes and Kant, Hume and Newman, Butler and Voltaire? Is it the modern method of Kant or Hegel or Spencer? Is it idealism, or realism, or transcendentalism, or positivism, or agnosticism, or scepticism, or a fashionable blend of all these in a literary eclecticism? We fell out with Scholasticism on account of its subtlety and obscurity. Shall we fall in love with the limpid clearness of Kant's *Kritik*, or Hegel's *Logik*, or Spencer's *Psychology?* Shall we fly from the futility of *Ens Rationis* to the shelter of the reconciliation of opposites and the absorption of everything in its other? But if we do, we can hardly justify ourselves under the plea of coming more in contact with mankind

and being more serviceable to our flesh and blood. But, perhaps, the modern method is not so much to be found in modern philosophy as in what is called modern science. Here, again, the difficulty is, "What is the modern method"? Is it the method in history, or mathematics, or literature, or physics, or biology? Are we to desert the crazy craft of Scholasticism for the binomial theorem or the romantic school of literature, or the realistic school of art, or the correlation and persistence of force, or the survival of the fittest? Surely, to propound such a thesis is not to reason but to dream. Indeed, it is a dream of the impossible to consider that amongst the myriad writers who have flooded the nineteenth century with works of art, literature, history, philosophy, mathematics, physics, dynamics, chemistry, and biology, there is any one definite spirit which marks them off from the writers of any other age, and gives them a right to supersede the combined scholarship of the scholastics.

General theses are the delight of younger men, and the torture of scholars. Nothing is easier than to frame a general statement, nothing more perplexing than to prove or even explain it. Were it necessary to word a thesis on the subject we have been discussing, the following would, perhaps, be a more definite form than that which we have set down at the head of this article, as the subject of our examination: "Some Characteristics of Scholasticism and Modern Methods; or, Scholasticism and the Philosophic Methods of the Nineteenth Century; or, Scholastic Philosophy and Modern Inductive Methods." But even such narrowly restricted theses as these cover much ground and tend to spread out in useless generalizations.

Of greatest importance to us who are called upon to profess a knowledge of philosophy and theology is the survey of our scholastic curriculum in detail with a view to supplementing it with the established findings of modern scholarship. A detailed attempt to provide such a survey would overtax the natural limits of an article in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. But we may allow ourselves to sketch the lines on which such an undertaking should run. Not to deal with abstractions, let us consider psychology, cosmology, metaphysics, theology, and ecclesiastical history. Leaving metaphysics out of consideration for the

moment, we may note a striking difference between modern scholarship and all that preceded it. Modern scholars either adopt or consider the momentous factor of evolution. Thus in psychology, though much has been done in recent years to make scientific observations and conclusions in physico-psychology and psychometry, yet the most important modern addition to psychology is the evolutionary view of the phylogenetic origin of organs and faculties. No Catholic philosopher can be fully equipped for his work, if he has not made himself acquainted with the *Principles of Psychology* of Herbert Spencer, or with works advocating the same or like views of *psychology*.

The student of *cosmology* must either accept or at least deal with the evolutionary theory of the universe. He will probably be surprised to observe how the generalization underlying evolution serves as a useful explanatory formula in geology and biology—nay, that it becomes the most convenient working principle for classifying and systematizing the vast materials and objects of these sciences.

In *metaphysics* a transcendental evolution must occupy the attention of Catholic philosophers. But the supreme subject of discussion must remain that of realism and the consequent subject of causality. Modern Catholic philosophers are perhaps meagre in their treatment of such fundamental questions, though much, if not all of this meagreness may be explained by the exigencies of a handbook.

The Catholic *theologian* has to deal with a many-sided form of evolution. He is brought face to face with the evolutionary theory of religion, and that complex form of it which we term Christianity. He must be prepared to give a patient hearing to philosophers who consider modern Christian religious thought and activity to be no more than a highly evolved emotional complex of the most interesting species of vertebrata. Moreover, in his discussions with heretics and schismatics, he will probably find himself forced to adopt some form of development, if he is to vindicate the continuity of our marvellously complex and organized theology, discipline and liturgy with the apparent simplicity of primitive Christianity. Furthermore, the transcendental evolution put forward by such as Hegel must be considered even when

not adopted by all Catholic students of the divine internal processions which are the basis of the Trinity, and the external processions which result in creation.

The Catholic *historian* must be prepared to follow the masters of modern history in their patient research, in their painstaking classifications, in the accuracy of their facts, in the reserve and rarity of their conclusions.

In all the above spheres of intellectnal activity, the modern scholastic who puts himself in touch with modern methods of philosophical, theological, or historical research must ever feel conscious of the thought that, far from diluting his mind with thoughts uncongenial to Scholasticism, he is but drinking more deeply of the spirit of such true scholastics as Bl. Albert the Great, and St. Thomas Aquinas. We must distinguish here as elsewhere between two very distinct questions—the scholastic methods of teaching philosophy, and the scholastic method of teaching.

Education in the Middle Ages, even as in the twentieth century, was not a fruitless search after the philosopher's stone, nor yet a spinning of intellectual cobwebs from the premises of a foolish credulity. No one was taken to have finished his scholastic course of study until he had mastered the *Quadrivium* and the *Trivium;* or, in other words, until he had acquired a satisfactory knowledge of what the scholarly world then knew of mathematics, history, physical science, and philosophy. It is clear from the pages of the *Summa* that St. Thomas was deeply versed in all the sciences of his day. His range of thought extends from the heights of the Trinity to the various forms of a commonwealth and the lawfulness of ruses in war. His last days, passed on a sick-bed, in the peacefulness of his Cistercian shelter, were employed in commenting on the Canticle of Canticles, and, if we may believe tradition, in writing a work on aqueducts. No one could profess to have inherited his scholastic method or spirit who would stand aloof from the scientific acquirements of his own times in mathematics, history, the natural sciences, and philosophy.

Perhaps there are concrete reasons why modern methods of discovery and teaching throw some minds out of touch with the Scholasticism of our modern philosophical curricula. There is

the fact that philosophy is practically viewed by us as an introduction to theology. Such a view, though undoubtedly true, is not self-recommendatory to men who look on theology as a belated survival of spook and ancestry worship. When men of this mental make are asked to give their sympathy to modern scholastic methods they feel that they are but asked to take under their roof a stranger who will turn out to be an enemy. They find it utterly repugnant to taste, not to say assimilate, a doctrine which prepares the mind for Transubstantiation or the Trinity. They will have none of a method which disciplines the mind to rise up to an act of faith. They almost feel that were they to toy with Scholasticism, it would go hard with them if they did not come to hold every mystery from the Trinity to the Ascension, and submit to every Catholic rite from Baptism and Confession to the adoration of the Cross and the sprinkling of blessed ashes. Scholastics have toiled successfully to prove that philosophy is the handmaid of theology. And modern scholars of a certain school take care that if the handmaid shares in the honor, she shall still more share in the disrepute, of her mistress.

Another reason for the divorce between Scholasticism and some phases of modern thought is to be found not in its relations to theology but in its relations to theologians, who, through good luck or ill, are now our only or our chief scholastic philosophers. It would be euphemism to say that the Scholasticism as presented by some of our modern text-book makers is a mind-forming, though it may well be a mind-informing, system and method. It is sometimes painful to the careful spectator of modern thought to read from time to time in our reviews how certain excellent second-class text-books are "epoch-making," "masterly summaries," "without which no priest's library can be complete," and so on. As a confirmed and unrepentant student of one of the fountain-heads of Scholasticism I may venture to ask if the stream has not been greatly mudded and puddled by the restless feet of these commentators. The numberless *Cursus Sacrae Theologiae* are not such stimulating nectar as the *Summa*. If we have gone away from the fount and dug wells to ourselves, our longing for a more invigorating Scholasticism is not unnatural. To slake our thirst we must go further up the stream. Our modern authors

are not to be despised, nor must the above words be conceived as a reproach to men who are above reproach. But they themselves would be the first to own that in their struggles with the profusion of modern developments in theology and philosophy, the old philosophical spirit of brilliant analogy and generalization has become well nigh a lost art. A commentary on the *De Trinitate* of St. Thomas will now be thrice the bulk of the text. Theologian philosophers must never forget that as in architecture, so also in philosophy, the mind of genius is detected in the planning of main lines, in the balanced contrast of masses, in the gradation and juxtaposition of color, in the happy and natural employment of material to its best advantage, in the foresight of atmospheric effects, in the unity of conception based on unity of aim, in the noble achievement of concentrating the most thought in the scantiest material. It will be a joyful day for modern Scholasticism when we train not merely the logical, but the thinking faculties by personal contact with the great architects of Scholasticism. Two questions still remain to be suggested in this querulous paper: "Is our modern seminarian philosophy rightly and accurately called Scholasticism?" which I suppose it is; and, "Are our modern professors and pupils moved by the youthful, enthusiastic, empiric, apostolic spirit of the true Scholastics?"—which they must settle for themselves.

VINCENT MCNABB, O.P.

Woodchester, England.

CARENTIA OVARIORUM EST IMPEDIMENTUM DIRIMENS MATRIMONIUM.

CONTRA Dissertatiunculam nostram "*Carentia ovariorum est impedimentum dirimens matrimonium*" cl. P. Hild, C.SS.R., insurrexit propositionem contradictoriam propugnans. De quo quam maxime laetamur; disputationibus enim veritas veluti expolitur ac pulchrior affulget. Nam veritas, ut ait Augustinus, volentibus vel nolentibus hominibus, vincat oportet; ipsique veritatis oppugnatores opere suo nonnisi splendorem eius magis magisque patefacere valent.

Quod et in casu nostro evenisse iam patet; non solum enim illustris adversarius sententiam nostram intactam omnino reliquit; sed conatu ac patrocinio suo peiorem ipsius causam reddidit, ut clare patebit.

I.

In primis, ut aliquid generaliter innuamus, in articulo nostro synthesis totius Dissertationis invenitur syllogismo sequenti: *Ex Ecclesia* invalide contrahit matrimonium qui impedimento impotentiae laborat; atqui *ex physiologia* mulier carens ovariis laborat impedimento impotentiae; ergo mulier sine ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere non potest.

Iamvero illustris opponens nonnisi propositionem minorem impetere poterat, et hoc fecit, verum impotentiae conceptum pervertendo: mulierem enim sine ovariis *sterilem* vocavit, quam nos *impotentem habemus;* et sic minorem propositionem syllogismi negavit. Cum igitur adversario ac nobis identicus non sit conceptus impotentiae, praestat illum recte determinare, ut possibilis evadat controversia.

Age vero: impotentia in subiecta materia definitur ab ipso adversario: *inaptitudo ad copulam perfectam;* quod nos ultro concedimus. Ast copula, iuxta praecl. adversarium cum praecl. duce suo Eschbach, est perfecta, quando *vir naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit.*

Sed haec definitio est omnino reiicienda, utpote inadaequata et contraria doctrinae *certae* S. Alphonsi et S. Thomae, quos illustris adversarius pro se citare non haesitavit.—(*a*) Est inadaequata; quia non continet omnia elementa necessaria; nam copula completa seu perfecta amplecti debet tum organa hominis, tum organa *necessaria* mulieris, tum eorum *essentialem aptitudinem pro fine,* ad quem actus coniugalis ordinatur. Definitio autem adversarii est unilateralis, vel saltem si respicit hominem adaequate, non respicit adaequate mulierem. Ubinam gentium enim didicit cl. adversarius ad copulam perfectam maritalem, de qua sola hic solliciti sumus, semen hominis esse necessarium, et nihil ex parte feminae requiri? Ratio ob quam in definitione copulae seu coitus maritalis ponitur hominis semen est, non quia illud necessarium est ad copulam materialem, sed ad copulam formalem, scilicet aptam

ad generationem. Ast pro copula apta ad generationem necessarium est tam semen hominis, quam ovulum feminae. Cur igitur hoc discrimen inter hominem et mulierem, ut in definitione copulae necessarium putetur semen hominis, et praetermittatur ex parte feminae id, quod aequivalet hominis semini, scilicet ovulum? Nonne membrum viri relativum est vasi feminae; sicut semen eius relativum est feminae ovulo? Et tamen in definitione copulae maritalis ab adversario ponitur membrum virile, vas femineum, semen hominis, et non feminae ovulum!

Uti patet, adversarius non definit copulam formalem, seu coitum maritalem perfectum; sed tantummodo materialem et quidem partialiter. Ergo definitio copulae perfectae ab adversario ex cl. Eschbach prolata est omnino reiicienda, utpote evidentissime inadaequata.

(*b*) Praeterea illa definitio est apertissime contraria doctrinae S. Alphonsi et S. Thomae. Juxta S. Alphonsum, in hypothesi de necessitate seminis feminei pro generatione, mulier, quae seminare non valet, *est impotens*, etiamsi vas eius membro viri penetretur, ac in illud verum semen effundatur. Perlegat illustris adversarius L. 6, n. 1095, ubi S. Alphonsus ita loquitur: "Impotentia in femina esse censetur, quando vel seminare non potest, *si verum est semen feminarum requiri ad generationem*, vel propter arctitudinem non potest virum pati, aut eius semen recipere." Ergo iuxta S. Alphonsum definitio allata a cl. adversario ex cl. Eschbach est reiicienda, saltem in hypothesi de necessitate feminei seminis ad generationem. Quod autem S. Alphonsus affirmat hypothetice de semine feminae, absolute est nunc affirmandum, si loco seminis feminei ponatur ovulum, quod certissime necessarium est ad generationem.

Idem S. Alphonsus L. 6, n. 1095, Res. 3, haec habet: "Impotentia, de qua loquimur, est illa, propter quam coniuges non possunt copulam habere *per se aptam ad generationem:* unde sicut validum est matrimonium inter eos, qui possunt copulari, esto *per accidens* nequeant generare, puta quia steriles aut senes; vel quia femina semen non retinet; ita nullum est matrimonium inter eos, qui nequeant consummare *eo actu, quo ex se esset possibilis generatio.*" Definitio adversariorum clarius condemnari non posset. Nam iuxta S. Alphonsum adest coitus, et coitus, scilicet

coitus aptus ad generationem, et coitus non aptus. Coitus aptus est ille, quo *ex se* esset *possibilis* generatio: quod nullo modo verificatur in coitu cum femina ovariis totaliter carente; coitus non aptus est ille, quo *ex se non* esset *possibilis* generatio: hic autem nullum reddit matrimonium, et plene verificatur in coitu cum femina ovariis totaliter carente. Insuper iuxta S. Alphonsum coitus, *per quem vir naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit*, non est aptus ad generationem, et proinde matrimonium nullum reddit, si femina per se seminare non potest: seu si femina caret ovulis et ovariis. Ergo definitio adversariorum est contraria doctrinae S. Alphonsi.

Praeterea est contraria doctrinae S. Thomae. Angelicus Doctor *S. q. 55*, a. 4, ad 2, ait: "Vir et mulier efficiuntur in carnali copula *una caro per commixtionem seminum.*" Et ratio ob quam concubitus contra naturam non causat affinitatem, est, iuxta S. Thomam S. q. 55, a. 3, ad. 3: "quia ibi non habetur commixtio seminum, quae possit esse causa generationis." Et sic iuxta S. Thomam non habetur copula perfecta, seu coitus maritalis perfectus, quo vir et mulier efficiuntur una caro, et quo *affinitas* causatur; nisi semen hominis misceatur, seu misceri *possit* semini, seu ovulo mulieris. Et sic definitio copulae maritalis a cl. adversario ex Eschbach prolata, utpote ovuli necessitatem excludens, est contraria doctrinae S. Thomae; etenim commixtione illa tum in actu tum in potentia absolute ac necessario exclusa, ut accidit in muliere ovariis totaliter carente, non habetur amplius copula seu *coitus maritalis*, sed materialis congressus, qui matrimonium non respicit.

Unde cl. Bucceroni, *Instit. Theol. Mor. Ed. IV Romae, vol. II, n. 994*, de doctrina S. Thomae in re nostra ita loquitur: "Profecto ex S. Doctore ad essentiam matrimonii non pertinet potentia ad *copulam* seu coniunctionem carnalem, seu corporum, *quamcunque*, secus intelligi possit etiam copula sodomitica; sed potentia ad copulam carnalem *coniugalem:* et haec alia non est ex *tota doctrina angelici Doctoris in Suppl.*, quam illa, *quae ordinatur ad generationem.*"

Ex quibus omnibus patet in conceptu coitus *maritalis* necessario includi id, quod est essentiale generationi. Datur enim coitus sodomiticus; coitus vel per se vel per accidens ineptus ad

generationem; coitus per se aptus ad generationem. Hic ultimus tantummodo matrimonium validum reddit. Ille autem, per quem vir naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit, non est per se aptus ad generationem, si femina ovariis totaliter careat; ergo matrimonium validum non reddit.

Adferat illustris adversarius, si valet, testimonium ex S. Thoma ex S. Alphonso, vel ex aliquo magnae notae theologo seu Canonista, qui clare et explicite affirmet, coitum *per se* ineptum ad generationem sufficere ad matrimonium validum constituendum. Dicat adversarius utrum coitus inter virum et mulierem, utroque ovario absolute carentem, sit *per se* aptus ad generationem.

Ut paucis innuamus: coitus perfectus maritalis, seu copula perfecta non concipitur, nisi omnia elementa ibi contineantur, quae necessaria sunt ad generationem, ad quam essentialiter copula ipsa ordinatur. Et quoniam ovulum feminae eiusdem omnino necessitatis sit ac semen hominis; sequitur ad coitum maritalem ovaria necessario requiri; sequitur mulierem ovariis totaliter carentem laborare impedimento impotentiae; sequitur syllogismum nostrum, quo tota thesis continetur, nullo modo offendi animadversionibus cl. adversarii; sequitur tandem illius definitionem copulae perfectae esse inadaequatam, et contrariam doctrinae S. Alphonsi et S. Thomae.

II.

Quae breviter hic superius tetigimus satis esse deberent ad quamcunque cl. adversarii obiectionum vim infringendam; nam totus eius articulus fundatur in falsa definitione coitus coniugalis, quam ipse ex cl. Eschbach mutuavit. Praestat tamen aliquid particulariter diversis eius obiectis hic subiungere.

1. Cl. adversarius adserit nos plane confundere re ipsa impotentiam *coeundi* cum impotentia *generandi*. Confusio mihi videtur adesse tota in articulo ipsius. De quonam coitu enim loquitur ipse? De coitu sodomitico, de coitu non maritali, vel de maritali? Impotentia coeundi maritaliter certissime implicat impotentiam generandi; sicut impotentia *per se* generandi est impotentia coeundi coitu *maritali*. Ast impotentia *per accidens* generandi non est impotentia neque coeundi neque *per se* generandi. Adversarius supponit dari posse coitum maritalem simul cum impotentia

physica et absoluta generandi, quod falsum est, ut supra exposuimus. Deinde adversarius confundit explicite et clarissime impotentiam absolutam et physicam generandi cum sterilitate, quae est toto coelo diversa, ut in praecedenti articulo explicavimus.

Quod ab illo dicitur de *maiore* impotentia in muliere carente ovariis, et de *minore* in vetula ovariis omnino exsiccatis praedita, est arbitrarium, cum in articulo nostro non reperiatur.

Arbitraria est etiam accusatio de inconstantia ex hoc, quod atrophiam organorum essentialium docuerimus esse impotentiam; et tamen vetulis, atrophia etiam *absoluta* ovariorum ex senectute laborantibus, matrimonium permittere, *iuxta ipsum, debeamus.* Cl. Antonellius enim tunc atrophiam impotentiam importare dixit, quando illa talis est, ut copula *ex natura sua necessario* infecunda sit. Hoc autem evenire potest tum in senibus tum in iuvenibus. Quid potius respondet adversarius, si vir senex, quamvis erectionem patiatur et *materialem* copulam perficere queat, ob senectutem tamen careat semine, quod ipse in definitione coitus posuit?

Cl. adversarius deinde pro conceptu *theologico* determinando citat homines laicos theologiae ieiunos, quod frustraneum esse nemo non videt.

2. Cl. adversarius miratur in Dissertatione nostra nullam inveniri responsionem ad *valde doctam* et *gravem* opinionis nostrae *refutationem*, quam profert cl. Eschbach. Et nos e contra miramur ipsum *coctum recoquere*, cum in toto articulo repetat argumenta cl. Eschbach, quae cl. Antonellius Romae duobus editis opusculis in nihilum redegit. Unde clariss. De Luca post disputationem inter Eschbach et Antonellium iustissime iudicavit: "Antonellius Rev.mum P. Eschbachium *palmarie* refutat." De caetero neque scopus Dissertationis nostrae, neque natura illorum argumentorum, iam refutatorum, requirebant quod ab adversario desideratur.

3. Cl. adversarius adserit opinionem nostram contradicere verae doctrinae hucusque traditae. Cui respondemus *duas* usque ad nostram fere aetatem fuisse scholas relate ad definitionem copulae perfectae maritalis, pro duabus scholis physiologicis, scilicet pro duabus opinionibus physiologicis, quarum unius auctor fertur Aristoteles, alterius vero Hippocrates et Galenus. Docuit Aristoteles *L. 2. de gen. animal. c. 2.*, feminam nullum semen dare ad

prolem concipiendam, sed tantum materiam. Docuerunt Hippocrates et Galenus feminam etiam subministrare debere proprium semen; quod, mixtione facta cum semine virili, sobolem gigneret.

Inde factum est, ut duae theologorum scholae originem haberent, quarum una amplexa est doctrinam Aristotelis, et copulam maritalem perfectam definivit, quin in definitione semen mulieris includeret; altera vero oppositam physiologicam Hippocratis et Galeni sententiam amplexa est, et copulam maritalem perfectam tali modo definivit, ut explicite ibi includeret quidquid est necessarium ad generationem tum ex parte viri tum ex parte feminae.

Duae illae oppositae scholae igitur conveniebant in aliquid, non conveniebant in aliud. Conveniebant quando *theologice* loquebantur; scilicet quando copulam perfectam pro valore matrimonii exigebant; et quando copulam non perfectam, scilicet *per se physice* et *necessario* ineptam ad generandum, matrimonium invalidum reddere adserebant. Non conveniebant vero quando loquebantur *physiologice*, scilicet quando elementa, ad copulam perfectam necessaria, in concreto determinare vellent, quaerentes utrum semen mulieris (quod hodie *ovulum* vocatur) sit essentiale ad generationem necne. Nonnulli enim respondebant *affirmative* cum Aristotele; alii cum Hippocrate et Galeno respondebant *negative*.

Inde duae scholae, inde usque ad nostram fere aetatem duae sententiae *hypotheticae*, quae tantum valent, quantum valent hypotheses; tamdiu durant, quamdiu durant hypotheses; tamdiu probabilitatis robur retinent, quamdiu certitudo non exurgat, quae falsam alterutram hypothesim reddat. At si errores physiologici supprimantur, utriusque scholae theologi in idem conspirant, nullaque inter eos discrepantia deprehenditur.

Jamvero cum certissimum nunc sit hypothesim Aristotelis esse falsam, ac proinde suppositum illorum theologorum, qui eum secuti sunt, esse falsum; et cum suppositum illorum theologorum, qui Hippocratem et Galenum sunt secuti, sit verum, si loco seminis adhibetur nomen ovuli; sequitur necessario scholam illam hypotheticam, cui cl. adversarius opinionem nostram contradicere adserit, non amplius neque probabilitatis robur retinere.

De caetero theologi antiqui non poterant de ovulis et ovariis loqui, cum neque eorum existentiam perspectam haberent. Et sic

opinio nostra adversatur doctrinae alterius scholae, quae fundabatur in falso supposito, et quae fuit *vera hypothetice;* sed nunc ipsa est *certissime falsa* ob falsitatem suppositi, quo nitebatur.

Cl. adversarius deinde citat pro se S. Thomam, S. Bonaventuram, Sanchez ac S. Alphonsum. Sed, pace illius, *citationes non sunt ad rem*, cum summi illi Theologi loquantur de sterilitate, quae cum matrimonio consistere potest, non autem de impotentia physica et absoluta generandi, prouti habetur ex ovariorum absentia totali. Et iam vidimus S. Thomam et S. Alphonsum reiicere principia adversarii in hac materia.

Relate ad verba S. Thomae *S. 58, art. 1, ad. 3*, ab adversario citata, ita loquitur cl. Bucceroni loc. cit.: "Senibus et sterilibus matrimonium ex A. D. *conceditur secundum quod est in remedium, quamvis non competat eis* (nempe *de facto* non competat eis) *secundum quod est in officium, naturae;* minime vero *quamvis eis competere non possit* secundum quod in officium naturae, stante *physica impotentia* ad generandum. Hoc enim ex A. D. reddit matrimonium impossibile. Loquens enim de triplici matrimonii bono, prolis, fidei, sacramenti, ait quod bonum prolis est principalius, et essentialius, immo principalissimum et essentialissimum: 'Proles est essentialissimum in matrimonio.' Quomodo istud *essentialissimum* haberetur, si in matrimonio sufficeret copula *per se inepta ad generationem?* Ita ergo senibus et sterilibus matrimonium competere potest ut, istud essentialissimum non desideretur, nempe non *in actu*, sed in potentia. Immo ita est iterum istud essentiale et essentialissimum, ut neque illi senes, neque alii omnes matrimonio coniuncti possint ex A. D. *licite* in copula carnali intendere remedium, quin simul intendant officium naturae. Quid igitur si *positive* excludant, positive reddendo impossibile illud officium, et quoad liceitatem copulae post contractum matrimonium, et quoad ipsius matrimonii contrahendi validitatem?" Ex quo iam patet quinam sit verborum S. Thomae et aliorum sensus.

Adversarius supponit finem secundarium matrimonii dari simul cum impotentia physica et absoluta generandi: quod est idem ac supponere finem secundarium matrimonii *sine* matrimonio. Ad rem cl. Bucceroni in suo "*Casus Consc.*" Ed. IV, ita loquitur: "Impossibile est quod matrimonium sit ad mutuum *quoque* vitae

adiutorium et ad concupiscentiam sedandan, *nisi sit matrimonium.* Atqui matrimonium essentialiter coniunctio in ordine ad prolem est (*saltem in potentia per se*) . . . Ubi autem physice impossibilis proles, impossibilis est coniunctio in ordine ad ipsam" (*ac proinde impossibile est matrimonium, impossibile mutuum quoque vitae adiutorium*, impossibilis concupiscentiae sedatio).

Ex Schmaltzgr. l. 4, t. 15, n. 32: "Remedium concupiscentiae haberi debet non per *quamcunque* copulam; sed per eam, quae *ex natura sua* sit apta ad generationem prolis." Unde verba S. Thomae, ab adversario allegata, intelligenda sunt *supposita potentia generandi, seu habendi copulam maritalem perfectam*, sine qua matrimonium consistere non potest.

(*b*) Quae speciatim ex S. Alphonso allegantur, intelligenda sunt eodem modo, scilicet iuxta principia S. Alphonsi. Unde haec verba: "Valide contrahunt steriles, quia etsi SINT *impotentes* (per accidens) *ad generationem*, non tamen ad copulam, etc.," haec verba, inquam, nullo modo se possunt referri ad feminam ovariis carentem, cum ipse S. Alphonsus eodem in loco aliquantulum inferius dicat, impossibilitatem habendi copulam per se aptam ad generationem constituere veram impotentiam, quae matrimonium invalidat. Ergo in loco, ab adversario citato, verba *impotentes ad generationem* referuntur ad steriles, seu ad impotentes *per accidens*, ac proinde non sunt ad rem.

4. (*a*) Cl. adversarius adserit S. Alphonsum docere "*matrimonium subsistere posse* TANTUMMODO propter sedandam concupiscentiam, exclusa etiam *possibilitate* illius finis primarii," et ad hoc probandum citat *L. 6, n. 882, magis versus finem.* Veniam petimus a cl. adversario, si dicere cogimur ipsum hic non retulisse doctrinam S. Alphonsi, qui in eodem loco ita loquitur: "Ad rationem autem contrariae sententiae; nempe quod sit deordinatio *eligere* finem secundarium prae primario; respondetur, quod deordinatio quidem esset si ordinaretur finis primarius ad secundarium, sed non si ex *duobus* finibus licitis secundarius prae primario *eligatur.*" Ex hisce verbis clarissime patet S. Alphonsum non solum non excludere finem primarium, quando adserit licere, tantum ad vitandam incontinentiam, matrimonium inire; sed ipsum supponere; secus enim non haberetur *electio* finis secundarii prae primario: electio enim saltem inter duo esse debet. Et tamen adversarius

confidenter scribit: " Et nihilosecius S. Alphonsus *et tot ac tanti cum eo theologi tenent, etc.*"

Aliud est licitum esse matrimonium inire *ad vitandam incontinentiam tantummodo*, quod non excludit possibilitatem generationis; aliud est matrimonium *subsistere* posse tantummodo propter sedandam concupiscentiam, exclusa etiam possibilitate generationis. Illud admittitur a S. Alphonso, non alterum.

(*b*) Quae cl. adversarius refert ex. cl. Eschbach ad respondendum comparationi nostrae inter feminas castratas et homines castratos, iam confutata sunt in principio, quando verum conceptum coitus maritalis determinavimus. Cl. Eschbach enim tenet cum adversario nostro, veram copulam coniugalem haberi posse simul cum impotentia absoluta et physica generandi, quod est falsum; et cum responsiones ipsius fulciantur illo falso supposito, cadunt omnes cum ipso.

(*c*) Adversarius accusat nos de mutilatione verborum in Decisionibus S. Officii referendis: quam mutilationem, iuxta ipsum, commisimus praetermittendo haec verba: *Re mature diuque perpensa.* At haec verba nihil omnino adiungunt Decisionibus S. Congregationis, quae semper *diu matureque rem perpendit.* Omisimus illa verba, quae sunt formula communis, quae solet a S. Congregatione affingi generatim omnibus Decisionibus, ut brevitati consuleremus, quin aliquid substantiale decisionis omitteremus. Unde miramur cl. adversarium innocuam illam omissionem notasse.

Prosequitur cl. adversarius aperte et clare innuens, illas duas Decisiones S. Officii esse tamquam leges generales: et, ut hoc probet, provocat ad *praxim* nonnullorum theologorum (quos in hoc laudare non deberet), qui illas Decisiones tamquam leges generales citant. Sed cl. adversarius non deberet hoc in casu citare pro se illos theologos, qui violant *praxi* principia *theoretica* ab ipsis inculcata, uti iam vidimus in articulo praecedenti relate ad D'Annibale ac Génicot. De caetero quomodo potest illustris adversarius provocare ad D'Annibale, qui in *4a ed. 1897, vol. 2, n. 431, nota 9*, ita loquitur: " Nubere non prohibetur mulier, quae 1° *sterilis* effecta est per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum (S. U. I. 3 Feb. 1887), quia sterilitas non idem est ac impotentia; vel 2° utero careat, *dummodo concipere possit.* Utrum

vero concipere possit necne, medicorum iudicio relinquimus?" Uti apparet, Card. D'Annibale in primo casu supponit in muliere potentiam, seu possibilitatem physicam generandi (*sterilis* effecta) vel ob operationem non perfectam, vel ob ovaria supplementaria. Et certe si ovariorum excisio talis esset, ut mulier per illam fieret tantummodo sterilis, nubere non prohiberetur. In altero casu permittit matrimonium vel non, secundum quod mulier generare potest vel secus, de quo medicos iudices declarat. Principia nostra igitur Cardinalis D'Annibale admittit, scilicet: mulierem ovariis carentem matrimonium inire non posse, si physice et absolute generare non valet, de quo medici iudicabunt.

Hoc unum certum est autem, Decisiones S. Officii in duobus praefatis casibus, etiam post animadversiones cl. Opponentis, nihil aliud esse, nisi Decisiones particulares pro casibus omnino particularibus, quorum circumstantiae ignorantur. Non sunt neque decreta generalia, neque leges. Quapropter non sunt ad rem ea, quae cl. adversarius citat ex *Il Monitore* Cardinalis Génnari, qui ibi loquitur de promulgatione *legum* ecclesiasticarum, et adversarius illa arbitrario duabus illis particularibus Decisionibus applicat. Adversarius exclamat emphatice: "Ubi S. Officium non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus." Respondeo: Ubi S. Officium non confundit, nec nos confundere debemus.

(*d*) Cl. adversarius animadvertens in aliud argumentum nostrum, quo demonstravimus carentiam ovariorum esse carentiam rei, contractui matrimoniali *essentialis;* unde matrimonium cum tali muliere est invalidum, tamquam si celebretur sub conditione in pactum deducta vitandae prolis; citat S. Bonaventuram, qui loquens de hac re distinguit inter carentiam sive absentiam prolis naturalem et artificialem; et adserit contractum matrimonialem posse esse *sine* prole et *contra* prolem. Si est contra prolem, est invalidum matrimonium, si est sine prole, est validum. Hoc autem *sine* prole intelligendum est in sterilibus et in continentibus, ut ait S. Bonaventura; non autem in casu de femina ovariis penitus orbata, quae non est sterilis, sed impotens. Et si sensus verborum non esset iste, illa verba plus nimio probarent, et essent falsissima. Unde citatio illa ex S. Bonaventura *Opera omnia, om. IV, p. 720,* non est ad rem.

Citatio autem ex Doctore Angelico S. 49, a. 3, non contradicit

argumento nostro, neque ubi ovaria matrimonio essentialia dicimus, neque ubi invalidum dicimus matrimonium ob conditionem vitandae prolis. Et si S. Thomas prolem, tamquam intentionem prolis, vocat essentialissimum in matrimonio, sequitur ex ipso essentialissimum esse id, quod est necessarium ad prolem, prouti sunt ovaria in femina.

(*e*) Cl. adversarius adserit quatuor Decisiones ex S. C. Concilii a nobis allatas confirmare opinionem eius; quatenus in illis quatuor casibus mulier semper carebat *vase* debito pro coitu. Hic discimus adversarium habere pro vase debito coitus, *non generativi*, non solum vaginam, sed etiam uterum! Ad memoriam ipsius tamen revocamus etiam in casu a S. Congr. S. O. die 30 Julii 1890 deciso, mulierem passam fuisse ablationem uteri, quem ipse vas debitum putat; et nihilominus S. Congr. respondit: "Matrimonium non esse impediendum." Etiam hic adversarius eadem aequivocatione laborat, quod scilicet coitus maritalis sit possibilis sine potentia physica generandi.

(*f*, *g*) Quod adseritur a cl. adversario de publicatione cl. Bucceroni, et de opinionibus nonnullorum Professorum Romanorum, videtur nobis exaggeratum et nimis probare. Nos quaerimus veritatem, et nihil aliud.

(*h*) Tandem cl. adversarius inurgit contra nos ex eo, quod scripsimus: "Quid tandem dicendum de moralitate oppositae sententiae? Neminem latet ipsam onanismi crimini viam latissimam aperire etc." Uti patet, nos comparationem instituentes inter nostram et oppositam sententiam, hanc coniugibus ansam pro onanismo committendo praebere adseruimus; et hoc etiam in hypothesi de validitate matrimonii cum muliere castrata; unde non diximus copulam illam esse obiective onanisticam, quod erat demonstrandum; sed *viam* onanismi crimini *aperire*. Deterriti detestabilibus delictis, quibus in magnis praesertim civitatibus, ex medicorum confessione feminae tam multae abscissionem ovariorum arte sibi procurant ad prolem vitamdam, vel ad indulgendum impune passionibus effrenatis; deterriti malis, quorum ferax est illa sententia tum contra pacem domesticam, tum contra singulos homines et contra societatem, nos iterum atque iterum clamabimus: sententia, quae tenet mulieres penitus carentes ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere posse, non solum onanismi crimini viam aperit, sed

societatem ac familiam turbat ac irreparabiliter offendit. Ita ut, etiam in hypothesi quod carentia ovariorum non sit impedimentum dirimens matrimonium *de iure naturae*, desiderandum esset ut summus Pontifex tale impedimentum constitueret *de iure ecclesiastico.* De caetero in hypothesi de veritate sententiae nostrae, quod nos propugnamus, copula illa esset revera onanistica.

Cl. adversarius pro sustinenda opinione sua ac nostra infirmanda exclamat: "non debet quisquam vel magis catholicus esse, vel plus sapere quam Roma ipsa." Sed nonne hac censura notandus esset ille, qui particulares decisiones particularium casuum *leges* ac *decreta generalia* esse docet; ac, sub aspectu libertatis humanae protegendae, finem primarium, ob quem sacramentum matrimonii institutum fuit, non protegit?

Ut finem imponamus huic nostro articulo, breviter ac synthetice, notamus: animadversiones omnes cl. opponentis, plus minusve, supponunt *coitum maritalem*, seu *copulam coniugalem perfectam*, esse possibilem simul cum impotentia *radicali* generandi, quod est falsum; supponunt deinde finem secundarium matrimonii, scilicet sedationem concupiscentiae, obtineri posse etiamsi finis primarius, seu generatio, sit *physice* et *per se* impossibilis, quod est falsum. Recolantur haec duo ac serio perpendantur.

Interea memores illius: In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas; dum gaudio videmus sententiam, quam nos defendimus, gradatim defendi etiam a summae notae Theologis, ut recenter accidisse nunc conspicimus clariss. quoque Palmieri, qui illam in ultima editione Gury exponit ac tuetur; gratias quamplurimas agimus adm. Rev. P. Hild, qui animadversionibus suis opportunitatem nobis praebuit nonnulla declarandi, quae lucem aliquam afferre valent, ut omnes videant ac admittant syllogismum nostrum: *Ex Ecclesia* invalide contrahit matrimonium qui impedimento impotentiae laborat; atqui ex *Physiologia* mulier carens ovariis laborat impedimento impotentiae; ergo mulier sine ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere non potest.

N. Casacca, O.S.A.

Villanova College, Pa.

WORK AND SCOPE OF THE PROPAGANDA[1]

AT all times the Catholic Church has endeavored to fulfil the command of her Divine Founder: "Go and teach all nations. . . . Preach the Gospel to every creature . . . ;" still there are certain periods in her history when her apostolic mission manifests itself more strikingly. Such is the sixteenth century. The discovery of America and the finding of a new route to India and the Far East opened untilled fields to the apostolate, while the defection of several European nations from the faith of their ancestors gave new impetus to missionary spirit: the losses caused by the so-called Reformation were to be compensated by the reception of other peoples into the true fold of Christ. The large increase in the number of missionaries who in the sixteenth century implanted the faith in new countries made it necessary to create a special department in the administration of the Church at Rome, and this was done by Gregory XV, who, in 1622, established the "Congregatio De Propaganda Fide," or Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, commonly called the Propaganda. The object of this sketch is to give an outline of its origin, aim and methods, of the extent of its jurisdiction, of its resources in men and money, etc.

The Aim, Organization and Personnel of the Propaganda.

The pontifical document which created the Propaganda indicated clearly its functions: "The prelates who will compose it will consult about, take cognizance of and treat all and every kind of business which pertains to the propagation of the faith in the whole world . . . they shall superintend all missions for the preaching of the Gospel. . . " The Pope then determined the personnel and laid down the rules governing this new department; they have practically remained unchanged. The Congregation of the Propaganda is composed of about twenty-eight Cardinals; over one-half of them reside in Rome, the others are Bishops of various countries, like Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore; Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, etc. It is, of course, clear

[1] For the principal data contained in this sketch the author has consulted *Le Vatican*, par Goyau. Paris: Pératé et Fabre. 1895.

that the Cardinals who do not reside in Rome can take but a very indirect part in the work of the Propaganda. They are honorary rather than active members. However, when they happen to be in Rome they do not fail to attend the meetings and make use of their functions. One of the resident Cardinals is prefect or president; at present Cardinal Gotti, recently appointed. Besides the Cardinals, there are thirty-eight consultors, of whom over one-third belong to various religious orders, besides several assessors, interpreters, archivists, etc. The various business matters pertaining or submitted to the Congregation are divided among those officials and decided according to their importance in the ordinary weekly meetings or in the solemn congregation held once a month, at which all the Cardinals are present. In those meetings the questions under consideration are examined and discussed after the reading of the reports prepared by consultors, assessors, etc., and a decision is taken by a majority vote of the Cardinals. Those decisions may concern the spiritual or the temporal welfare of the missions, the creation of new vicariates, the appointment of Vicars, Bishops and other chiefs of missions, the settlement of difficulties, etc. In all cases the decisions are referred to the Holy Father for final approval.

Extent of the Jurisdiction of the Propaganda.

For government and administration purposes Rome divides the world in two very unequal parts. The smaller comprises the Catholic countries; the other, immense as far as territory is concerned, the missionary countries. Let us remark at once, lest those appellations give a wrong impression, that the title of *Catholic* given to a country does not necessarily imply that all its inhabitants are Catholics, or that there is no need of missionary work among them; but it implies that the Catholic Faith has been preached and implanted all over the country, and that in spite of the ravages of modern infidelity the great majority of the people profess no other religion, though there may be a certain number who do not live up to its teachings. In Catholic countries the laws of the Church—those laws especially which regulate the relations between people and pastors, priests and bishops, local churches with the head of the Church, etc.—apply in full, unless

they have been modified by special concordats between the Pope and the temporal powers. The religious affairs of those countries are attended to according to their nature by the various Congregations or departments of the Church's administration at Rome, which may be compared to the various departments of our civil administration at Washington.

The missionary countries are those in which heresy, schism or infidelity prevails. Although the faith has perhaps been preached there for centuries, it has made as yet little progress—*e.g.*, in China, Japan, etc. Or again, those countries which were Catholic at certain periods of their history but abandoned the fold, like England, Scotland, parts of Germany, etc.; or having been invaded by Mohammedanism, the number of Catholics has dwindled into insignificance, as in Turkey,[2] Asia Minor, etc. Such countries the Holy See regards as special mission fields and usually applies to them a distinct form of government. Those young churches or those new Catholic settlements would not be able to carry out in full all the requirements of the ordinary church legislation; separate laws are enacted for them, which are specially adapted to their condition, and they are placed under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda, which will supply for them all the other departments of the ecclesiastical administration.

Keeping these distinctions in mind, let us now enumerate the countries placed under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda as missionary fields:

In North America: The United States, Canada, Lower California, Honduras, the West Indies, excepting the Islands of Cuba, Porto Rico, Hayti, Guadaloupe, and Martinique.

In South America: Guiana, Patagonia, three Prefectures Apostolic in Peru.

In Europe: Great Britain and Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Luxembourg, parts of Germany and Switzerland, Greece, Crete, and all the Balkan States.

In Africa: The whole continent, excepting Algeria, Carthage, Ceuta, Angola, and the Canaries and Bourbon Islands.

[2] It may happen that for very special reasons, mostly political, certain countries are not counted as missionary, in the canonical sense of the word, though almost entirely non-Catholic—*e.g.*, Russia; while in others the missionary form of government is applied, when the great majority of the people are Catholics—*e.g.*, Ireland.

In Asia: The whole continent, excepting Siberia and the See of Goa in India.

In Oceanica: All except the Philippines.

How the Propaganda Carries out its Conquests.

The Pope being the Vicar of Christ on earth has the whole world under his jurisdiction, which he can exercise at any time in any church matter. Practically, however, the world has been parcelled out into dioceses, vicariates, and prefectures entrusted to the care of Bishops, Vicars, and Prefects Apostolic. And although it may be said that there is no portion of the globe which does not come under the jurisdiction of some of those church officials, still in many cases that jurisdiction is merely theoretical, owing to the immensity of territory it embraces or to the fact that it is as yet void of churches and faithful.

In some of those unexplored quarters, or in a region where infidelity or heresy reigns, two or three missionaries may be sent to open a Christian settlement. The Propaganda gives a name to that newly-born church and assigns a place to it in its catalogue; it is called a mission; if it develops it is made a prefecture apostolic, and territorial limits are assigned to it and it acquires a legal existence. After a time, the number of converts growing, churches having been built and congregations formed, the prefecture is transformed into a vicariate apostolic. Prefectures and vicariates apostolic may be well compared to our territories, which have not full autonomy and do not enjoy all the rights and privileges conferred by statehood. Later on, the vicariate having extended its conquests will be divided into new centres of missions, over which new chiefs will be appointed. Thus did the Apostles, founding missions wherever they went, which were divided when the number of faithful called for a new administration.

A striking example of that process may be seen in what took place in central and southern Africa during the nineteenth century. In 1835 those regions were almost unexplored. Gregory XVI founded three vicariates apostolic; under Pius IX those three vicariates were divided into thirteen vicariates or prefectures; the

same process continued under Leo XIII in proportion to the progress of Catholicism, and to-day there are in that portion of Africa twenty-four vicariates, eighteen prefectures and four missions. The same process was carried out and is still being carried out in America, Asia, and Oceanica.

How the Propaganda Organizes its Conquests—Vicariates—Prefectures—Apostolic Delegations—Titular Bishops.

There are only two degrees in the hierarchy established by the Propaganda: the prefects and the vicars. The prefect is a simple priest who has not received the episcopal character; he may have been granted, however, permission to give the Sacrament of Confirmation and the minor orders. In administration matters he exercises the powers of a bishop, dividing missions, appointing pastors over them, etc. Such is, for example, the prefect apostolic of Alaska, a Jesuit father who resides at Juneau. Vicars apostolic, since the seventeenth century, received episcopal consecration. That custom was introduced by the founders of the seminary for foreign missions at Paris—Bishop Pallu and Bishop de Lamothe Lambert. They asked Pope Alexander VII that the chief of missions be given the episcopal dignity.

To preserve the Church's custom of giving to a bishop the title of an established see, Mgr. Pallu was appointed Bishop of Hieropolis, Mgr. Lambert, Bishop of Beyrouth. These were ancient bishoprics no longer actually administered, and therefore called titular in opposition to the residential sees. There are over three hundred titular bishoprics, which take their names from cities in Asia, Europe, and Africa, once residences of a bishop. Islamism or the invasions of the barbarians swept away the fold, the city has perhaps disappeared or has become a hamlet, but the Church has maintained the episcopal title; she does not consider her eviction as final; she hopes that one day those titular sees will become anew the residences of bishops. She can wait, having promises of immortality; and in the meantime she gives the titles of those ancient cities to certain church officials whose functions demand that they have episcopal powers; such are the coadjutor and auxiliary bishops who need the power of confirming, ordaining, and the like,

and who nevertheless have not the charge of a diocese; such are also the vicars apostolic who have no residential see and are merely the delegates of the Propaganda in whose name they exercise their ministry and to whom they are, like the Prefects, directly responsible. They were for a long time called Bishops "*in partibus infidelium*," among the infidels; but certain countries where are found some of those sees, for example Greece, were displeased at being called region of infidels, and so Leo XIII, in 1882, decided that those bishops would henceforth be called titular bishops. Titular Bishop of Messene is, for example, the title of the present Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina.

Besides appointing Prefects and Vicars, the Propaganda sends also Apostolic Delegates; there are at present ten in the following countries: Turkey in Europe, Egypt and Arabia, Greece, Oriental India, Mesopotamia, Kurdistan and Armenia Minor, Persia, Syria, the United States, Canada, the Philippines.

Those delegates who are titular Archbishops represent the Propaganda and are placed over Prefects and Vicars Apostolic, having limited jurisdiction. The Delegates in the United States, Canada and Oriental India are placed over archbishoprics and bishoprics properly established. In all cases their powers are confined to spiritual matters; they do not represent the Holy See at the Courts or capitals of foreign countries as do the Papal Nuncios in the Catholic countries of Europe and South America.

The Episcopal Hierarchy Substituted for the Missionary Form of Government.

It is not accurate to say that the Propaganda extends its jurisdiction over missionary countries only; it controls also churches which have passed that stage of formation and where archbishoprics and bishoprics have been substituted for the prefectures and the vicariates; as, for example, the United States of America. In the early colonial days the few Catholic missions were placed under vicars apostolic of England, and in 1688 under the vicar of London. A century later the clergy of the United States solicited a superior from the Pope, and Dr. Carroll was appointed prefect apostolic in 1784. It was the intention of His Holiness to make him vicar apostolic at the earliest possible moment; but, owing to

circumstances, this was not done, and in 1789, Pius VI, having created the see of Baltimore, Dr. Carroll was appointed to it; twenty years later Pius VII made him an Archbishop, and from his diocese, which then comprised the thirteen original States, created four episcopal sees: New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Bardstown, now Louisville, in Kentucky; the division and subdivision has been continued ever since.

Theoretically a country in which a hierarchy is constituted of archbishops and bishops ceases to be under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda and falls under the general form of Church administration. Having attained the age of manhood it is, so to speak, emancipated, just as a Territory may be said to be emancipated when admitted to take place among States of the Union. But owing to the many privileges granted to the subjects of the Propaganda and the greater facilities of business transactions with Rome through that Congregation, the privilege was granted to the American Church to remain under its tutelage; the same was done for England, Scotland, Holland, Australia, etc., when the hierarchy was reëstablished in those countries during the nineteenth century.

From this it follows that the Propaganda rules over a great variety of countries; it includes the negroes of Central Africa and the faithful of London; the missions of Patagonia and the flourishing dioceses of New York and Chicago; the newly born Christian settlement and the fully grown church.

How Prefects, Vicars Apostolic, Etc., are Appointed.

Prefects apostolic are appointed directly by the Propaganda. Vicars are appointed with more formality. The chiefs of missions are required to send frequent reports of their work to the Congregation; among the questions put to them there is one on the qualifications of the missionaries who might be named vicars apostolic in case of vacancy or the creation of a new vicariate. When this occurs, a choice is made from the names proposed, a titular see is selected and the proceedings are submitted to the Pope for approval. Residential Bishops of the countries subject to the Propaganda are appointed on the presentation made by the clergy or a portion of the clergy of the vacant diocese and the Bishops

of the province. This mode of presentation is different for the different countries. It is as follows, according to the rules enacted in 1884 by the Third Council of Baltimore, for the American Church: When an episcopal see is vacant either by the death or the transfer of its incumbent, a list of three names (*terna*) is made by the majority vote of the consultors and the irremovable rectors of the diocese. This list is submitted to the Bishops of the province, who may subscribe to it or not. In case they do not, they make up in the same manner another list of three candidates, and both lists, which contain a detailed description of the relative merits of the men chosen, are sent to the Propaganda; there they are carefully examined and discussed by the Cardinals, and the election is made in a solemn meeting of the Congregation. It may happen, however, and in fact does happen, though rarely, that for special reasons a candidate is appointed whose name was on neither list; the Propaganda exercising supreme jurisdiction, and the bishops and priests having only a restricted right of presentation.

The Colleges of the Propaganda.

Under Urban VIII, J. B. Vives, a Spanish prelate, offered to the Propaganda a palace he possessed in Rome located on the "Piazza di Spagna." In this palace the Pope established a college "or apostolic seminary under the Patronage of SS. Peter and Paul, and the name of Urban, for the propagation and the defence of the Catholic faith." He assigned to it a certain income supplemented by the donations of some rich ecclesiastics. It is to-day under the direction of secular priests and the supervision of the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. The students, who number about one hundred and twenty-five, come from all parts of the world, but principally from the Orient; as many as twenty-five of thirty nationalities being at times represented.

The students of the college of the Propaganda take a solemn oath to spend their lives under the supreme direction of the Congregation, in the missions where they may be sent. There they will work unsparingly and forever for the diffusion of the Gospel and the salvation of souls. They will send to Rome a report of their work and the progress of religion in their district every year,

if they work in Europe, otherwise every other year. They will not enter a religious order or congregation without the special permission of the Holy See.

Since Alexander VII (1660) all the Propagandists, as they are called, take that oath; the Congregation which has educated them remains, so to speak, the ruling power of their lives: they must not forget their Alma Mater and she will continue to extend over them her authority and protection. The founder of the College, Urban VIII, had given the following programme to its students: "They must expose themselves to death and martyrdom, if need be, for the defence, progress and propagation of the Faith, and this to the end of time, until the number of the elect be complete and there be one fold and one shepherd!" To work until all living beings have entered the true fold of Christ, such is the aim of the Urban College! To shed their blood, if need be, to attain that end, such is the sublime means proposed to its students; and the red sash which they wear on their black cassocks is the symbol of the violent death which may be in store for them and which many have met.

Besides the Urban College there are in Rome and outside of Rome a number of other colleges preparing missionaries for the service of the Propaganda. They may be divided into two classes: In some, young men born in countries where heresy or infidelity is prevalent are preparing to evangelize their own countrymen; in others, clerics mostly born in Catholic countries prepare for the preaching of the Gospel to nations foreign to them by race and language.

Among the latter the most important is doubtless the seminary for Foreign Missions established in Paris in 1663. Since that date it has given about 80 names to the martyrology and it contains at present over 300 students, while the number of its missionaries at work in Asia is more than 1,200, under the leadership of 34 Vicars Apostolic. Other establishments of the same nature are: The Seminary for African Missions at Lyons; the Seminary for Foreign Missions at Milan; the Roman Seminary of SS. Peter and Paul; the Seminary of Verona for missions among the negroes; the College Brignole Sale at Genoa; St. Joseph's Seminary at Mill Hill, England; the German-Dutch

Seminary for Foreign Missions at Steyl, Holland; the American College at Louvain; the Belgian Seminary for Foreign Missions at Scheutlez-Bruxelles; the English College at Bruges, etc. These colleges were not founded by the Propaganda, they are due to private initiative; but the very nature of their aim placed them under the direction of this Congregation.

Among the colleges preparing native missionaries, several are in Rome and owe their origin to the Popes. Such is the English College established in Rome by Gregory XIII in 1579; the students are all English-born and will propagate the Faith in England. Clement VIII founded the Scotch College in 1600, while the Irish College was established under Urban VIII. Two other Irish colleges were later on opened in Rome, one by the Franciscans and the other by the Augustinians. Pius IX founded the American College for the United States, and Leo XIII the Canadian and Dutch Colleges, as well as the Armenian, Maronite, and Greek Ruthene Colleges in which young men are educated according to their own rites. The students of these Colleges generally follow the course of studies given in the College of the Propaganda, while a clerical training adapted to the needs of their future ministry is given them in their own houses.

Outside of Rome we find a number of colleges preparing clerics for missionary work in their own country to which they are bound to return; for instance, the English colleges of Valladolid and Lisbon, the Scotch college at Valladolid, the Irish college at Paris, etc. Let us not forget the important establishment of Poulo-Pinang (in the Straits of Malacca, off the Siamese coast) kept by the priests of the foreign missions of Paris, in which Chinese, Indo-Chinese, and Burmans are educated for the priesthood. Finally, in many vicariates of China, Japan, India, etc., there are seminaries for the natives who have received the divine call to a missionary life.

We do not mention the *local* colleges or seminaries preparing young men either for *general* home missionary work, such as the various seminaries in the United States, England, etc., or for *special* missionary labors, such as St. Joseph's Seminary at Baltimore for negro missions, and the house just opened at Washington for missions to non-Catholics.

The formation of a native clergy for the evangelization of heathen lands and non-Catholic countries has always been the wish of the Propaganda. St. Francis Xavier in the sixteenth century recommended it to be done as soon as possible, and Leo XIII wrote in his letter to the Hindus (1893): "The zeal of missionaries come from Europe meets with many obstacles, the greatest being the ignorance of a language, sometimes most difficult to master, and new customs and habits to which one is not used even after many years. This is why the European clergy is looked upon as totally foreign in India. It is evident that native priests will inspire greater confidence and their work will be followed by more lasting results."

Thus while the first kind of colleges for foreign missions render valuable services by giving priests to certain countries where no vocations could as yet be found, the Church desires the establishment of seminaries where natives are prepared to preach and minister in their own country. Native clergy alone will strengthen the position of the Catholic Church. That was the idea of Urban VIII when he founded the College of the Propaganda.

From the foregoing it must not be understood that the priests trained in the colleges enumerated are the only ones at work in the missions. In fact they are only a small portion of the large army of Catholic missionaries, the majority of whom belongs to the various religious orders. It is the invariable rule of the Church to entrust to the care of every religious order, congregation or society a portion of the world to be evangelized. For example, the Franciscan, the Dominican, the Jesuit, the Lazarist, and other orders have some of their members at work in China and elsewhere, and so it is with all other religious congregations.

Now these missionaries have been trained in houses of their orders and were designated by their own superiors for an apostolic life. Once on the missionary field they continue to follow the rule of that order or society as far as it is compatible with their labors, and are subject to their superiors in all that concerns their individual life. But in regard to the administration of the mission they follow the rules given them by the Propaganda; the Prefects, Vicars Apostolic and even Bishops are appointed in the manner described above, and send their reports to the Congregation, on which they are dependent as well as secular missionaries.

The Printing Establishment of the Propaganda.

The Congregation of the Propaganda was hardly founded when it felt the need of having a printing-press attached to it so as to furnish students in the college and missionaries at large with books in various languages. It was established in 1626; types of all kinds, especially of Oriental languages, were procured at great cost, and as early as 1639 the Propaganda was able to issue a catalogue of its publications. The printing-press of the Propaganda has been under the direction of scholars of great renown, among others Ruggieri and Amaduzzi in the eighteenth century. It is the latter who introduced in Europe certain alphabets of the Far East hitherto unknown. At the time of the French revolution the Propaganda's press lost many of its treasures, but the losses were repaired under Gregory XVI, and in 1846 it was able to print books in 57 languages, viz., 27 European, 22 Asiatic, 5 African, and 3 American. Under Pius IX liturgical books of the Oriental rites were printed under the supervision of the learned Cardinal Pitra. The most important works published under Leo XIII are the great edition of the works of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Greek Bible from the Codex Vaticanus.

Every three years a Missionary Directory is issued under the title of "*Missiones Catholicae Cura S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide descriptae.*" It gives a complete and authentic account and description of all the Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures and Missions under the jurisdiction of the Congregation.

We find in the last catalogue of the press of the Propaganda about 700 different works, mostly religious, or various editions of the same, representing 38 languages. Books may be found there in Ethiopian, Persian, Arabic, Turkish, Chaldaic, Syrian, Coptic, Sanscrit, Japanese, Chinese, Madagascan, etc., besides the European languages. The Propaganda has therefore well deserved the gratitude not only of Christian philanthropists but of philologists as well.

Together with an important library the Congregation possesses an interesting collection of curios and souvenirs brought by missionaries from all parts of the world. Let us mention among others the famous map of the newly discovered world on which

Pope Alexander VI drew a line of demarcation to settle the disputes between Spain and Portugal. What lay to the west was to belong to Spain, and what to the east to Portugal.

The Finances of the Propaganda.

The needs of the Propaganda are immense, like its ambition, which is to convert the whole world. Gregory XV began to provide for them by assigning to it the revenue of the cardinalitial rings. Each newly created Cardinal receives from the Pope in Consistory a ring which has been furnished by the Propaganda, and in exchange for this he is expected to make an offering to that Congregation. The sum was fixed at one thousand dollars by Gregory XV, but reduced to six hundred by Pius VIII; it continues to be paid.

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries numerous donations were made to the Propaganda by Popes, rich ecclesiastics, and pious laymen, so much that it was found necessary to give the Cardinal Prefect, who attends to the spiritual affairs of the Congregation, an assistant Cardinal, called "Prefetto di economia," who watches over its temporal affairs. That office is filled at present by Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli.

The invasion of the Roman States by the French troops and the burden imposed on the Pope by Napoleon I after the treaty of Tolentino greatly injured the Propaganda's finances. After his return to Rome, Pius VII began to make up for the losses by assigning to it the revenues of the vacant Italian episcopal sees; but the income thus derived is small, uncertain, and irregularly paid. On the occasion of his Jubilee, in 1888, Leo XIII exempted them from that tax for twenty years.

At present the annual revenues of the Propaganda amount to about $135,000, a sum hardly sufficient to support its numerous personnel, its college, its university, its printing establishment, etc., without mentioning the cost of maintaining certain missions, mostly in the East, of which it has taken special charge.

Formerly the Propaganda could help missions not merely with its revenues, but also by alienating parts of its capital, when unexpected misfortunes demanded extraordinary help. This cannot be done any longer, owing to the action of the Italian Government.

In 1873 the Italian Parliament enacted a law according to which all ecclesiastical properties in the former Papal States were to be converted into Government bonds. The enforcement of the decree in regard to the Propaganda's properties was postponed by Victor Emmanuel, who feared a scandalous lawsuit. But in 1880, under his successor, they were placed for sale by order of a royal commissary; the Congregation made opposition, but was condemned by the Tribunal and the Court of Appeal of Rome. The Court of Cassation, however, reversed the sentence, and the suit was begun anew at the instance of the Government before the Court of Ancona. The Propaganda was condemned again, and this time the judgment was ratified by the Court of Cassation, which contradicted thereby its former decision. Regardless of their international character, origin and aim, the properties of the Propaganda were to be sold and the proceeds invested in Italian bonds. Of course, the Pope and the Prefect of the Propaganda entered a solemn protest; a long and public controversy was begun between Cardinal Jacobini and the Italian Minister, Mancini, the first denouncing the injustice and the dangers of the action, the second asserting its perfect legality and harmlessness. Protests poured in from all parts of the Catholic world, but they had the effect of those against the Armenian massacres or the crushing of the Boers; the decision of the Court was carried out. On this occasion Mr. Ruggero Bonghi, the very author of the Law of Guarantees, wrote: "To paralyze the action of the Propaganda will benefit neither mankind, nor civilization, nor Italy."

The Propaganda therefore no longer disposes of its capital, and its revenues are subordinate to the credit of the Italian Government. In 1894 certain manipulation of the Italian finances brought about by the dire distress of the kingdom, diminished its income by $8000, and a bankruptcy of the Bank of Italy, which is by no means improbable, would mean the bankruptcy of the Propaganda. Financially speaking the Congregation is in the hands of the Government.

The first care of the Congregation thus spoliated was to make provision for the free disposition of future donations. In 1884 Cardinal Simeoni named eleven European cities—naturally all outside of Italy—three cities in Asia, one in Africa, five in America.

and one in Australia, where a Papal nuncio or a bishop or a vicar apostolic would act as the agent of the Propaganda in receiving and investing donations made for its work.

It is needless to say that Catholic missionaries who cannot gain their support from the people for whom they work, must not look to the Propaganda for much assistance. They are helped by several societies founded during the last century to organize and give form to the charity of the faithful in behalf of missions. The most important of these societies is the International Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founded in Lyons in 1822. It is established all over the world, and furnishes the principal support for the Catholic Apostolate. Since its foundation it has collected over sixty-seven millions of dollars, of which nearly six millions were distributed to missions in the United States. Other societies, auxiliaries of the Progaganda for the obtaining of funds for the missions, are: The Association of the Holy Childhood and the Association of Oriental Schools founded in France; the Society of St. Francis Xavier, in Aix-la-Chapelle; the Association of St. Peter Claver, in Salzburg; the Leopoldsverein, in Austria; the Ludwigsmissionverein, in Bavaria; not to mention several "anti-slavery," "Holy Land" associations and societies for home missions. We must add also that nearly all religious orders and congregations in charge of missions publish a bulletin giving an account of their labors and through which they solicit the charity of the faithful. None the less, if we were to combine the results of all these sources we would see that what Catholics do for foreign missions is little compared to what is being done by Protestants for the same object. Our missionaries have to rely on sacrifice and the blessing of God, and the success of their work compared with the failure of Protestant missions shows that personal zeal is more powerful than gold for the conversion of the infidels.

The Propaganda and the Orient.

There are two commissions connected with the Propaganda to help it in its manifold labors: one to examine the reports sent from time to time by bishops, vicars, and prefects, on the condition of the missions under their care; the other, created by Pius

IX, in 1862, attends to the affairs of the Oriental Rites. A sketch of the latter may be of interest.

By rite we understand the liturgical rules for the administration of the Sacraments, the celebration of the Mass, and the other external forms of worship. In the Orient the vernacular is used in the celebration of the liturgy instead of the Latin. The Oriental ceremonies also differ from ours. Hence our rite is called the Latin rite in distinction from the various Oriental rites.

The Christians of the East who do not follow the Latin rite may be divided into three classes: the heretic, the schismatic, and the United Christians.

1. In the fifth century the errors of Nestorius were adopted in Eastern Syria at about the same time as those of Eutyches in Western Syria. The Eutychians or Monophysites split into numerous sects which took the names of Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian. For thirteen centuries those churches have been isolated from the centre of unity, their priests are ignorant, and their articles of belief unsettled. They have retained almost unchanged the rites followed at the time of their separation.

2. The Greek schismatics or separated brethren form the great majority of the Oriental Christians. Excepting Russia, they acknowledge the primacy of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. Up to the eleventh century they were in communion with Rome, though several attempts at separation had already been made. At the time of separation their dogmas were the same as ours. Since then and while those dogmas have undergone a natural process of development in the Roman Church they have remained asleep among the Greeks. In spite of differences of belief, more important to-day than they were at the beginning of the schism, the Greeks are not called heretics; they would readily be admitted into the fold if they would sign an act of union with the Holy See. Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria, many Christian settlements in the Turkish Empire, and finally Russia are schismatic. They follow the Greek rite.

3. The Oriental Christians in communion with the Holy See: The Directory of the Propaganda enumerates twelve rites of United Christians—

(1) The Greek rite pure, followed by a few hundred Christians at Constantinople, at Cesarea in Cappadocia and at Margara in Thracia.

(2) The Greek Bulgarian rite, followed by 30,000 Catholics in Macedonia and 3,000 in Thracia.

(3) The Coptic rite numbers 10,000 followers in Egypt.

(4) The Ethiopian rite has 25,000 in Abyssinia.

(5) The Syrian rite is practised by 200,000 Catholics on the coast of Malabar in India.

(6) The Greek Roumanian rite has about one million of adherents in Transylvania (Hungary).

(7) The Greek Ruthenian rite is followed by 3,500,000 Catholics in Galicia, Croatia and Northern Hungary. There are 60,000 Ruthenians in the Province of St. Boniface, Canada.

(8) The Greek Melchite rite is observed by 100,000 Syrians, while

(9) Of the same nation 22,000 Catholics have preserved the pure Syrian rite.

(10) The Syro-Chaldaic rite has about 50,000 followers in Mesopotamia, Persia and Kurdistan.

(11) The Syro-Maronite rite is followed by 300,000 Catholics in Syria and the Island of Cyprus.

(12) Finally the Armenian rite is observed in Constantinople, Alexandria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Persia, in some parts of Hungary and Russia by about 100,000 Catholics.

The emigration which has brought to the American shores peoples from all parts of the world has introduced in our midst Catholics belonging to some of the rites just mentioned. The Syro-Maronite, Greek, Melchite, Ruthenian, Armenian rites, etc., are represented in the United States, and as soon as their number justifies it the Propaganda sends priests of their nationalities to minister to them; and in several dioceses, New York, Boston, Scranton, Pittsburg for example, they have churches where their rites are carried out. Needless to say that in matters of ecclesiastical administration both priests and faithful are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese. Such is not the case in the East. There, ecclesiastical jurisdiction is personal instead of territorial as with us. Hence it may happen that the same city

will be the episcopal see of various Bishops belonging to different rites, each one governing his own clergy and people. For instance, Beyrouth in Syria is the residence of Bishops of the Syrian, Syro-Maronite and Greek Melchite rites.

The differences of rites affect in no way the articles of Faith, which are one and the same in the Latin Church and the Oriental Churches in communion with the Holy See. The doctrine of Rome on that point has never changed; it was always admitted that variety of rite is no breach of unity. In the early ages of Christianity the vernacular was used in the celebration of the sacred mysteries and the ceremonies were primitive and local. Rome herself used at first the Greek language in her ritual, and it is only in the fourth century that the Latin was substituted for it in the West, while there was a tendency toward uniformity in the ceremonial. In the East, on the contrary, they retained the old forms of worship, some dating from the second century, such as the Coptic, whilst others have a much more recent origin.

The rite is for Oriental Christians not only an element and a symbol, but also a proof and a guarantee of their nationality; hence their attachment to it, and the reason why the Popes have protected those rites with the greatest care. Priests and clerics are forbidden to pass from an Oriental to the Latin rite, and the missionaries sent by the Propaganda among the Greek schismatics, while exhorting them to return to unity must not advise them to abandon their rites, of which, on the contrary, they must be guaranteed the free exercise.

Living as they do among schismatics, heretics and Mohammedans, the Catholics of Oriental rites were naturally placed under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda when it was founded, but the need was soon felt of dividing the work, and as early as the time of Urban VIII commissions were appointed on "Questions of the Orientals" and on "Correcting the Liturgical Oriental Books," especially the Greek Missal, also called the Eucologe. In 1862, Pius IX created a special Congregation of the Propaganda for the Affairs of the Oriental Rite—"Congregatio de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Ritus Orientalis." This Congregation is presided over by the Prefect of the Propaganda and is composed of a number of Cardinals (twelve at present) of the same Congregation,

but it has its own secretary, consultors and officials. Each Cardinal has in charge one of the Oriental churches with the affairs of which he is particularly acquainted.

In spite of the efforts of Pius IX and Leo XIII to bring back to unity the schismatics of the East, the results have been poor. Indeed in 1870 the imprudence of certain Latin missionaries, who thought the unification of rites the necessary complement of Roman centralization, caused several defections among some of the united churches; they made their submission a few years ago. Leo XIII continues to show his paternal solicitude for the separated brethren, but their coming back to the fold is still a far distant ideal; in some countries, Russia for instance, missionary work is made impossible by the Government, in others it consists mostly in raising up the united churches and infusing some life into them.

Such is the Propaganda, which may be called the department of foreign missions of the Church. Its constitution recalls to mind that of the Church herself, having that twofold element of absolute centralization in government and perfect independence in the means adopted to attain the aim in view, the propagation of the Faith. Whilst the chiefs of missions, be they simple prefects or archbishops, remain directly responsible to the Congregation, to which they must give an account of their work, they are almost supreme in the direction of their missions, within of course the limits of ecclesiastical law. It is left to them to look for the helpers they need, priests, brothers or sisters, to direct them and watch over them, to see that charitable and educational establishments are founded and the means necessary to carry out the work obtained.

In conclusion, it may be asked, what is the number of Catholic missionaries? If the question were, what is the number of bishops, priests and religious under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda? we might answer by simply computing the figures given in the last edition of the Propaganda's Directory.[3] But it seems to us that those figures would convey a false impression, from the fact that although certain countries, like the United States, England, Ireland, etc., have remained subject to that Con-

[3] *Missiones Catholicae*, Junii 1901.

gregation, for various reasons in most places the actual missionary stage has passed. It is clear, for example, that priests working among people of their own race in the well organized parishes of Boston or Philadelphia can hardly be called *missionaries*, if we are to take the word in its popular sense, of one who has left his country to go to distant regions and especially heathen lands for the purpose of spreading the Faith.

On the other hand, the statistics of religious orders and missionary societies are difficult to obtain and generally unsatisfactory. Several writers who have studied the question think it a conservative estimate to place the number of Catholic missionaries properly speaking at 15,000 priests, 5,000 teaching brothers, and 45,000 sisters. Assuredly it is an astonishing number, but when we consider the work still to be done, we are prompted to address to all those who have at heart the diffusion of the Christian Faith the words of our Lord: "The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He send laborers into His harvest." (Luke 10: 2.)

J. Freri, D.C.L.,
Director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

Baltimore, Md.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.*

II.

WHAT the living Church of God handed down from generation to generation of believers as the symbol of the Apostles was, with slight variations affecting neither its substance nor its essential meaning, the Baptismal Creed of Christendom in the fourth and fifth centuries. St. Leo the Great, who became Pope in 440 A. D., writing to the monks of Palestine, refers to it as "the Symbol of salvation which you recited before many witnesses when you received baptism.[1]" And again, in a letter against Eutyches, addressed to Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, he says, speaking of that arch-heretic: "What

* See January number, pp. 1–17.

[1] Migne, tom. 54, col. 1068.

instruction has he got from the sacred pages of the New Testament and the Old, when he does not understand even the elements of the Symbol? Of the Symbol which is on the lips of all candidates for baptism throughout the whole world, that old man has not yet grasped the meaning.[2]" This period, then, in which it is matter of historical record that the Symbol was the Baptismal Creed of the Universal Church, is the true starting-point in the quest of its origin.

But before setting out on this quest, we shall do well to consider what our real objective is, and by what way we are to reach it. At the period we have taken for our starting-point, the Church of Rome has its Symbol, and the Church of Aquileia has its Symbol, and the Church of Antioch has its Symbol, and the Church of Alexandria has its Symbol. In short, the principal Churches throughout the world have each its own Symbol. Are we to seek a diverse origin for each of these Symbols, or for all a common origin? We must find one origin for all. And why? Because, after all, in spite of variations in the form and wording, the Symbol is one—one in its scope, one in its structure, one in type, one in all its essential elements. So little does St. Leo regard these variations in the form of the Symbol as affecting its unity that he affirms it to be, not only one in all the Churches, but "unchangeable" as well.[3] From the beginning there is "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all." The Faith of the One Fold is one from the first: therefore, is the Symbol or Confession of the Faith one. The one Church can have but one Creed—this needs not even to be pointed out to those that are of the household of the faith. As for those that are without, they have only to glance into the writings of the early Fathers to find how accordant their testimony is on this point. St. Leo does but echo the words of Christian Antiquity, as we shall have occasion to point out presently, when he speaks of the one and unchangeable Confession of Faith.

The conclusion thus reached on logical, theological, and historical grounds regarding the unity of the Symbol, is borne out also by analogical considerations. In living organisms unity of

[2] *Ib.*, col. 757.
[3] *Ib.*, col. 986.

structure implies unity of type, and unity of type involves unity of origin. Organisms sprung from the same source will vary; variation, indeed, is the very condition of their growth; but the unity of structure and type that is discernible in them will ever attest their common origin. So it is with the formularies of the Faith in the fourth and fifth centuries. Despite the variations that are visible on the surface, it is but an unpractised eye that will not detect the underlying sameness of type and lineament which bespeaks their common authorship. Even those who deny the Apostolic origin of the Symbol realize that there is an archetype to which all variant forms must be traced, though they are at a loss to know what that is, or where they are to look for it. Dr. Kattenbusch identifies it with the Old Roman Creed; Dr. Loofs follows the lead of Caspari in tracing it to the Johannine circle in Asia Minor.[4] Strange that none of these critics has been led to trace the archetypal Symbol to the Mother Church of Jerusalem. The cradle of Christianity would have been a not unlikely place to look for the aboriginal Creed of Christianity. And it might not have proved, it should seem, a bad "working hypothesis," that the men whom Christ Himself commissioned in Jerusalem to "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," had, in virtue of that commission and in accordance with it, drawn up the Formula of Faith which should serve all nations for their Baptismal Creed. But the method of historical criticism barred this hypothesis. Besides, it is not pleasant for people to be made to feel as the swart Moor of Venice felt when he exclaimed,

Othello's occupation's gone.

For the one Symbol, therefore, which, as Cassian, the disciple and deacon of St. Chrysostom, puts it, "expresses the Faith of all the Churches,"[5] we shall seek one origin. The variations in its form are easily accounted for by the necessity that arose in particular Churches for a more explicit statement of the doctrines it contained. And by what way shall we proceed in our quest? Not by the way of historical criticism, for that way is blocked.

[4] Cf. *The Church Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1902, pp. 218–22.

[5] Migne, tom. 50, col. 145.

It leads those who follow it, as has been already pointed out, into a cul-de-sac. The historical critic searches for the Symbol, or traces of the Symbol, among the remains of early Christian literature, after much the same manner as the biologist seeks for a species, or traces of a species, among the fossil remains of early geological epochs.[6] This is all well enough. But in the eagerness of his search, he overlooks a point of capital importance. Between literary remains and the fossil remains of plant or animal there is a radical distinction. The latter are mute and voiceless; the former, being the product of the living mind, have a tongue and can deliver their message to those who find them. Now, here is where the method of historical criticism is at fault. It takes the Symbol, by dint of piecing together the scattered elements of it, from the writings of Cyril and Rufinus and Augustine, and pays not the slightest heed to the warning which these same writings deliver at the same time. The very same writers who are the first to describe and expound the Symbol, and in the very act of describing it, tell us, in the most distinct way, and with patient iteration, that they did not themselves get the Symbol from written records, but from the lips of the living Church. What sort of criticism is it that is willing to trust these writers when they tell us what the articles of the Symbol were in their day, and in what order they were arranged, but will not trust them when they tell us how the Symbol was transmitted to them by their forefathers in the faith? It is silly of the critic to fancy that he can run with the hare and hunt with the hounds after this fashion. "I will accept nothing," he declares, "but what I can find documentary evidence for." All very well. But let the whole evidence be taken. It will not do to take this because it fits in with a preconceived theory, and reject that because it doesn't. The method that picks and chooses in this way is neither critical nor historical. "The very confession of Faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," says St. Basil, "from what written records have we it?" The critic may, if he likes, put this statement of St. Basil's to the test, and proceed to ransack written records for the Confession of Faith. He has a perfect right to do this. But he has no warrant, and no shadow of warrant, on

[6] *Dogma, Gierarchia e Culto*, p. 322.

failing to find it, as he was foredoomed to fail, to say that the Symbol did not then exist at all. This is an assumption so arbitrary that it is difficult to speak of it with composure. His assumed first principle will not let the critic see that he has been looking in the wrong place for the Symbol.

In our quest for the origin of the Creed, then, we shall set out, not with an assumed first principle, but with a fact proved by documentary evidence, and proved up to the hilt, namely, that the Creed was not transmitted in writing to the Christians of the fourth and fifth centuries, but handed down by word of mouth, and "graved on the fleshly tablets of the heart." The knowledge of this fact will be as a lamp unto our feet. In the light of it we shall not look for the Symbol itself in the writings of the earlier time, assured beforehand that it is not to be found there. We shall look only for traces of it, tokens of its existence in the minds and hearts of believers, in the mouths and on the lips of the neophyte and the martyr, and these we shall find in plenty.

Of course, no comprehensive or minute search into original sources can be made here, nor shall it be attempted, nor is it, indeed, needful. We shall pick up in passing one or two allusions to the Symbol from third century writings, and proceed straightway to the second century, which is to-day the battle-ground of the rival theories as to its origin.

Eutychianus, who became Pope in 275, A.D., says in the course of a pastoral charge to the Roman clergy: "See that you teach your flocks the Symbol and the Lord's Prayer."[7] In his letter to Magnus, written before the middle of the third century, St. Cyprian declares that, while those who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church "are baptized in the same Symbol as we are," yet they "have not the same law (interpretation) of the Symbol as we have, nor the same interrogatory."[8] In the time of St. Cyprian, therefore, the Baptismal Creed was known as the Symbol.[9] And the Saint draws a clear distinction between this Creed and the *trina interrogatio* or triple interroga-

[7] Migne, tom. 5, col. 166.

[8] Migne, tom. 3, col. 1143.

[9] Semeria says, in the work already cited: "S. Cypriano . . forse usa nello stesso nostro senso la voce simbolo." Tutt 'altro che "forse."

tory which is in use in the Church to this day. It is important to note this. The Symbol goes before the interrogatory in Cyprian, and this is the logical order. For the triple query of the minister of baptism supposes a knowledge of the Symbol in the candidate for baptism, else he could not make an intelligent reply. From this we may conclude that the Symbol is not derived from the interrogatory, but conversely, the interrogatory from the Symbol. Finally, there are distinct traces of the Symbol, nearly all the elements of it, indeed, to be found in a treatise on the Trinity written by Novatian, the schismatical anti-Pope and founder of the Novatian heresy, about 260, A.D. The opening words are: "The Rule of Truth requires that we should first of all believe in God the Father and Lord Almighty."[10]

Tertullian is a witness to the faith and traditions of the second century, his most notable works having been written in its closing years, or in the opening years of the century that follows. There are in his writings references almost without number to the Creed of the Church in his day. He does not call it by the name of Symbol, though he does use in describing it the word "tessera," which is also from the Greek and has the same meaning.[11] To Tertullian the Creed is "the doctrine," the "tradition," and more especially the "Law" or "Rule of Faith." In these several works[12] he gives us a more or less explicit statement of its articles, with a certain slight variation in each case. These are exhibited below in a tabular form for purposes of comparison with one another and with the Old Roman Creed.

Old Roman Creed.	De Praescript.	Adv. Prax.	De Virg. Vel.
(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty,	(1) I believe in one God, maker of the world,	(1) We believe one only God,	(1) Believing in one only God Almighty, maker of the world,
(2) and in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,	(2) the Word, called His Son, Jesus Christ,	(2) and the Son and Word of one only God, called Jesus Christ,	(2) and His Son, Jesus Christ,

[10] Migne, *ib.*, col. 885.

[11] I cite Father Semeria (*op. cit.*, p. 321) as authority here, not having been able to verify a statement for which he gives no reference.

[12] *De Praescript.*, *Contra Praxeam*, *De Virginibus Velandis*; Migne, tom. 2, cols. 26, 156, 889.

(3) Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,	(3) by the Spirit and power of God the Father made flesh in Mary's womb, and born of her,	(3) born Man and God of the Virgin,	(3) born of the Virgin Mary,
(4) Crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried,	(4) fastened to a cross,	(4) Him suffered, dead, and buried,	(4) crucified under Pontius Pilate,
(5) Rose again the third day from the dead.	(5) He rose the third day;	(5) brought back to life by the Father,	(5) on the third day brought to life from the dead,
(6) Ascended into heaven,	(6) was caught up into heaven,	(6) taken again into heaven,	(6) received in heaven,
(7) Sitteth at the right hand of the Father,	(7) sat at the right hand of the Father,	(7) sits at right hand of the Father,	(7) sits now at right hand of Father,
(8) whence He shall come to judge quick and dead.	(8) will come with glory to take the good into life eternal, and condemn the wicked to perpetual fire,	(8) will come to judge living and dead,	(8) will come to judge living and dead.
(9) And in the Holy Ghost,	(9) Sent the vicarious power of His Holy Spirit,	(9) From the Father the Holy Ghost Paraclete,	
(10) the holy Church,	(10) to govern believers,		
(11) remission of sins,			
(12) resurrection of the flesh.	(12) restoration of the flesh.		(12) through resurrection of the flesh.

We have here, in the writings of Tertullian, all the articles of the Old Roman Creed except the tenth (which is implied in one instance) and the eleventh. Are we to infer, because these two articles are wanting, that they were not to be found in the Creed that was in use in his day? By no means. Tertullian does not pretend to cite that formulary word for word. The words given above in parallel columns are picked from their context, where they are found, in some instances, mingled with

extraneous matter. Besides, the phrases in the several columns do not tally exactly with one another, nor with the words of the Old Roman Creed. Nor is the same number of articles given in each case, nor are the same ones. Thus, the twelfth article is wanting in *Adversus Praxeam*, and the ninth in *De Virginibus Velandis*, wherein the form approaches most closely to that of the Old Roman Creed. But who can doubt that the Rule of Faith which Tertullian so often refers to, and which he declares to be "absolutely one, alone unchangeable, and irreformable,"[13] had its setting of words fixed uniform, the same for all?

We may surmise that Tertullian's object in varying, as he does, the words in which he conveys the doctrines of the Creed was to veil from the uninitiated the sacred Symbol of the Faith, in accordance with the prevailing discipline of the secret. The economy of his language recalls that passage in the *Stromata* of St. Clement of Alexandria where he says that there are some things which his writing "will only name, and will attempt, while concealing yet to declare, and though hiding to manifest, and though silent to point out." One is at a loss otherwise to account for the curious circumstance that, in the three several places where Tertullian professes to be setting forth the content of the Rule of Faith, once and once only does he use exactly the same form of words, as a glance at the table given above will show.

But be this as it may, certain it is that we cannot rightly infer a given article to have been wanting in the Creed of Tertullian from the mere circumstance of his not making explicit mention of it. In the very passage in which he professes to be giving the "one, unchangeable, irreformable" Rule of Faith, he omits the ninth article, which he nevertheless gives in the other two places. What is more, we gather from a passage in his *Liber de Baptismo* that the tenth article, embodying belief in "the holy Church," was part of the Creed in his day. "Since, however," he there says, "the profession of faith is made and the pledge of salvation given under three (names), mention of the Church is necessarily added. For where the three are, that is, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, there is the Church, which is their body."[14] The

[13] *De Virg. Vel.*, loc. cit.

[14] Migne, tom. 1, col. 1206.

Baptismal Creed, therefore, included the tenth article in Tertullian's time. And if one were to infer from his not mentioning it in any of the three passages referred to above, that it was not included, the inference would be false and contrary to fact. Is there not the very strongest kind of presumption that a similar inference drawn from the same premises with regard to the eleventh article would similarly be unwarranted? Besides, the doctrine of the remission of sins is expressly affirmed in the treatise on Baptism (chaps. 6 and 10).

Irenæus, the disciple of that Polycarp "who had not only been trained by the Apostles, and had conversed with many of those who had seen Christ, but also had been constituted by the Apostles Bishop over Asia, in the Church of Smyrna,[15] is our greatest and most authoritative witness to the existence from the beginning and the Apostolic authorship of the Creed. He speaks of it in one place as "this outline"[16] (in the Greek, χαρακτῆρα) which corresponds to "symbol," the "tessera" of Tertullian, and the Latin "indicium" of Rufinus), but usually as the Tradition, and specifically as the Rule of Truth. With him, too, as with Tertullian, this "Rule of the Truth which he received by (in) his Baptism,"[17] is one and the same in all the world. After setting forth the principal articles of it, as exhibited in the first column of the syllabus given below, he goes on to say:

This preaching and this faith, the Church, as we said before, dispersed as she is in the whole world, keeps diligently, as though she dwelt but in one house; and her belief herein is just as if she had only one soul, and the same heart, and she proclaims and teaches and delivers these things harmoniously, as possessing one mouth. Thus while the languages of the world differ, the tenor of the tradition is one and the same. And neither have the Churches situated in the regions of Germany believed otherwise, nor do they hold any other tradition, neither in the parts of Spain, nor among the Celts, nor in the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor those which are situate in the middle parts of the world. . . . Nor will he who is weak in discourse abate aught of the Tradition. Yea, the Faith being one

[15] Adv. Haer., 1, 3, c. 3, 4. Not having this work in the original, I shall cite the English translation by Keble.

[16] Book 2, chap. 28, i.

[17] Bk. 1, c. 9, 4.

and the same, neither he that is able to speak much of it hath anything over, nor hath he that speaks but little any lack.[18]

As in Tertullian, so in Irenæus, we find three different forms of the Creed. They are arranged, article by article, in the following syllabus:

SYLLABUS OF CREED FORMS FOUND IN IRENAEUS.

Book First, c. 10, 1.	Book Third, c. 4, 2.	Book Fourth, c. 33, 7.
(1) Faith in one God the Father Almighty;	(1) Who believe in one God the Framer of Heaven and Earth,	(1) His faith is entire in one God Almighty, of whom are all things;
(2) and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God	(2) by Christ Jesus, the Son of God	(2) and in the Son of God, Jesus Christ.
(3) made flesh for our salvation, of a Virgin,	(3) who submitted to the birth which was to be of the Virgin;	(3) the Son of God become man
(4) and the Passion,	(4) who suffered also under Pontius Pilate,	(4)
(5) and the Rising from the dead	(5) and risen again,	(5)
(6) and the bodily Ascension into Heaven,	(6) and being received in brightness	(6)
(7)	(7)	(7)
(8) and His Coming from the Heavens in the glory of the Father . . . that He may administer just judgment to them all,	(8) will come in glory as the Judge of them that are judged	(8)
(9) and in the Holy Ghost,	(9)	(9) and in the Spirit of God
(10) who declared the Œconomies,	(10)	(10) the original system of the Church in the whole world[19]
(11) such as . . . persevered in His love, whether from the first or after penitency,	(11)	(11)
(12) and to raise up all flesh of all human nature.	(12)	(12)

[18] *Ib.*, c. 10, 2.

[19] To Irenæus the Church is not so much an article of the faith as its teacher and guardian.

From all of these forms the seventh article is wanting and the eleventh, which latter, however, is very clearly implied in the words cited above in the first column. We note the same peculiarity in these as in the forms found in Tertullian—a marked difference in the wording of the several articles, which is hard to believe to have been accidental. One thing is plain: neither Tertullian nor Irenæus gives us the very words, the *ipsissima verba*, of their Rule of Faith. Those words were written in their memories from the day of their baptism, but as if to baffle the curiosity of the curious, they do not choose to write them out. To try, therefore, to piece together from their writings the fabric of the Creed just as it stood in their day, were as futile as the act of one who should essay to build upon the shifting sands. But knowing what to do and what they tell us of the veneration in which this Rule of Truth was held, the jealous care with which it was guarded, the pains that were taken to grave it "on the fleshly tablets of the heart" of lettered and unlettered alike, the absolute oneness of the Faith of which it was the authorized Formula, the quality of unchangeableness that belonged and still belongs to it, we seem certainly not to lack warrant for affirming that the Creed learned by Irenæus from Polycarp was, article for article, if not word for word, the same as that which was recited two centuries after in the Church of Smyrna; and that the Creed in which the catechumen Tertullian professed his faith on the day of his baptism, was, in like manner, the same as that which St. Augustine expounds in his homilies.

This Rule of Truth, Irenæus assures us in the passage cited above, was the same in the East as in the West. And it was, he further assures us, transmitted by word of mouth. "To this Rule," he says, "consent many nations of the barbarians, those I mean who believe in Christ, having salvation written by the Spirit in their hearts, without paper and ink, and diligently keeping the old Tradition, who believe in One God the Framer of Heaven and Earth and of all things that are in them, by Christ Jesus the Son of God." After which he goes on to give the other articles that are to be found in the second column of the syllabus.

Let us now pause to consider how untenable is the position of the votaries of historical criticism. Relying mainly, if not wholly,

on the testimony of Tertullian and Irenæus, they affirm that the Symbol existed in the latter half of the second century. But it did not exist in the earlier half of the same century, say the critics, because it is not to be found in any writings. Consequently, it must have been composed about the middle of that century. By whom, and where? Probably at Rome, by some one or other whose name has been withheld.[20] We are asked to believe that the Creed of the Christian Church, the Creed which we know on the testimony of witnesses who lived at the time, to have been, already in the second half of the century, the unvarying Standard of the Christian Faith in all the Churches from the West even to the farthest East, was composed about the middle of that same century by an anonymous somebody. This Creed, which all the Bishops assembled at Nice could scarce venture to change by the addition of words that did but more explicitly declare the meaning of one or two of its articles, is assumed to have been framed and imposed upon the Christian world less than two centuries before by somebody or other whose very name is buried in oblivion. *Credat Judaeus!*

But this is not all. The very men, on whose testimony the existence of the Creed in the latter half of the second century is known to the critics,[21] declare repeatedly, in the most explicit and emphatic way, that it came down from the Apostles. This, however, as well as some other points, must be dealt with at another time.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.
St. Francis Xavier's College, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

[20] *Dogma, Gerarchio e Culto*, p. 324.

[21] Harnack's theory that the "Rule of Truth"' given by Iranæus is not the same as Tertullian's "Rule of Faith," which he admits to be identical with the Old Roman Creed, and that it was not at all a Baptismal Creed, will be discussed in the next article.

Analecta.

E. SECRETARIA BREVIUM.

I.

Circa facultatem Benedicendi geminam speciem Numismatum S. Benedicti.

LEO PP. XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Dilecti filii Hildebrandus de Hemptinne, Ordinis S. Benedicti, et Bonifacius Krug Abbas Ordinarius Montis Cassini curavere exponendum Nobis ex benignitate Romanorum Pontificum Decessorum Nostrorum cruces sive numismata a S. Benedicto nuncupata amplissimis indulgentiis fuisse aucta ac ditata. Horum geminas extare species, alteram communem et alteram a centenario anno MDCCCLXXX in vulgus diffundi coeptam. Verum cum nonnullae modo ortae sint dubitationes de usu facultatum benedicendi ipsa numismata eamque aliis veniam delegandi, ut omnis prorsus ambigendi causa tollatur, enixas Nobis iidem dilecti filii preces humiliter adhibuere ut interposita Apostolica Nostra auctoritate decernere idcirco velimus. Nos autem piis hisce votis libenti quidem animo annuentes ut et Nosmet Ipsi Benedicti

Patris Ordinem tot tantisque nominibus optime de Ecclesia Dei deque humana societate meritum peculiari amoris charitatisque studio complectamur, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius auctoritate confisi per praesentes perpetuum in modum concedimus ut omnes sacerdotes Ordinis S. Benedicti nunc et in posterum simpliciter sive solemniter professi privilegio huiusmodi benedicendi utriusque generis numismata, servatis servandis, utantur: ut Abbates qui praesunt Congregationibus gaudeant praeterea facultate delegandi sacerdotes saeculares ac regulares ad utriusque numismatum generis benedictionem: ut Abbati Primati atque Abbati Ordinario Montis Cassini praeter iura praecedentibus concessa ius insuper competat tribuendi facultatem quibusdam sacerdotibus ut et ipsi licentiam benedicendi praefatas cruces, seu numismata communia aliis quoque concedere possint. Quam quidem subdelegandi licentiam si agatur de numismatibus a centenario dictis ad originem eorundem numismatum efficacius recolendam penes solum Abbatem Ordinarium Archicoenobii Cassinensis esse volumus et mandamus. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuo valituris. Volumus autem ut praesentium litterarum transumptis seu exemplis etiam impressis manu alicuius notarii publici subscriptis et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis eadem prorsus adhibeatur fides quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XII Aprilis MCMII, Pont. Nostri Anno XXV.

PRO DOM. *Card.* MACCHI,
N. MARINI, *Substitutus.*

II.

LEO XIII LAETITIAM CUM ARCHIEPISCOPO SANCTI PAULI DE MINNESOTA PARTICIPAT, QUOAD CELEBRATIONEM QUINQUAGESIMI ANNI EX QUO SEDES CATHEDRALIS ERECTA EST.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabilis frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Quinquaginta annorum spatio feliciter emenso, ex quo Paulopolitanae civitati honor episcopalis Cathedrae delatus fuit, iure

catholicorum istorum animi laetitia gestiunt, parantque gratias Deo agere celebritate maxima. Praeteriti enim temporis memoriam repentibus obversantur nascentis istius eeclesiae primordia, exigua illa quidem atque humilia; fideles namque ad centena aliquot numerabantur nec nisi terni erant sacerdotes, qui sacra administrarent. At modo, Paulopolitana Sedes ad archiepiscopalem evecta, senas dioeceses obnoxias habet; omnesque non modo cleri ac fidelium frequentia, verum etiam pietate et catholicis institutis in exemplum florent. Libenter igitur, Venerabilis Frater, laetitiam vestram vobiscum communicamus; quasque vos Deo Optimo Maximo gratias acturi estis, easdem et Nos agemus, enixe implorantes ut qui vobis exordia uberrime fortunavit, laetioribus in dies incrementis augeat. Quia vero non ignoramus hanc rerum conditionem solatii plenam, maximam partem, deberi tibi, qui Paulopolitanae ecclesiae iam triginta et sex annis impendis operam; gratulamur navitati tuae, eaque quae sit etiam in posterum strenue factura iucunde ex hactenus actis praecipimus. Interea, testem caritatis Nostrae ac munerum divinorum auspicem tibi, Episcopis, clero ac fidelibus Paulopolitanae provinciae Apostolicam benedictionem amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XVIII Iunii MDCCCCI, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo quarto.

III.

Litterae Quibus.

LEO XIII.

Gratulatur Rev. Dom. H. T. Henry, Lit. Doct., ob Versionem Carminum Summi Pontificis Anglice redditam.

Illme Domine,

Volumen carminum, quae a Pontifice Maximo exarata tu anglice diuturnis curis reddidisti, non uno nomine eidem Pontifici pergratum accidit. Fecit namque pietas ut hunc Beatissimo Patri honorem haberes. Peritiae vero, qua praestas, tum latini tum patrii sermonis tribuendum quod susceptum opus cum laude perfeceris. Habeto igitur a Summo Pontifice gratias pro merito. Quas Ipse ut non agat modo sed etiam referat, apostolicam

benedictionem, suae pignus benevolentiae, tibi peculiari affectu impertitur.

Quod mihi exemplar laudati voluminis destinasti libenter habui. Tibique gratum animum testatus, peculiari existimatione me tibi profiteor

Addictissimum

MAR. *Card.* RAMPOLLA.

Romae, die 13 Decembris 1902.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

DIVIDANTUR VESPERAE, QUANDO FESTUM S. FAMILIAE CONCURRIT CUM FESTO SS. CORONAE SPINEAE.

Rmus Dnus Onesimus Machez, canonicus ecclesiae Cathedralis Atrebaten. et extensor Kalendarii dioecesani, de licentia R.mi sui Ordinarii a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione sequentis dubii humillime resolutionem expostulavit, nimirum: Quomodo anno proximo 1902 ordinandae sint Vesperae festi Sanctae Familiae Nazarenae quod, ex Apostolica concessione, transfertur ad feriam V post Cineres, et ita concurrit cum primis Vesperis SSmae Coronae Spineae cujus officium apponitur insequenti die?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque rite perpensis, rescribendum censuit: *Dividantur Vesperae juxta Rubricas.*

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 4 Martii 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

Conferences.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—An APOSTOLIC LETTER by which the faculty of blessing the medals and crosses of St. Benedict is indiscriminately granted to all priests of the Benedictine Order who have made either their simple or solemn profession. This includes the privilege of blessing the centenary medals (1880) of the same Order.

The abbots of the Order have moreover the power of delegating the same faculty to priests of any other Order and to seculars. To the abbots (primatial and ordinary) of Monte Cassino is reserved the right of sub-delegating the above-mentioned faculties.

II.—The S. CONGREGATION OF BRIEFS publishes the text of the congratulatory Letter sent by the Holy Father to His Grace the Archbishop of St. Paul, Minn., on occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the erection of that see.

III.—His Eminence CARDINAL RAMPOLLA addresses a congratulatory Letter from the Holy Father to the Rev. Dr. Hugh T. Henry, of Overbrook Seminary, in recognition of the translation of the *Poems, Charades and Inscriptions*, of which a copy had been presented to the august Pontiff.

IV.—The S. CONGREGATION OF RITES decides that when the feast *Spineae Coronae* follows immediately upon the feast *Sacrae Familiae* transferred to the first Thursday in Lent, the vespers in the Canonical Office are *a cap. de sequente.*

"THE MESSENGER."

The Messenger—we mean that dear old "*Messenger of the Sacred Heart*" as it used to be in the days of its devout adolescence—sends us a marked copy of its January number containing an editorial in which somebody reads us a wholesome lesson on the error of our ways.

We had said in the December number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW: "A good, large, carefully written encyclopædia published under Catholic auspices and censorship would do all the work which half a dozen wide-awake Truth Societies can accomplish in the same direction. The expense would be less, the effect greater, more permanent, penetrating, and conclusive. If a newspaper were to talk us down by misrepresenting Catholic doctrine, Catholic morals and aims, we should at once be able to cite facts, with chapter and verse, and bigotry itself would not be able to hide itself under false pretences of quoting authentic sources, when it goes to the *Britannica* or any other other 'poisoned well' for its definitions and statistics about Catholic matters."

Now some wicked person has persuaded *The Messenger*, or whoever writes the indignant apostrophe in its editorial columns, that we are "impatient with the well directed efforts of our Catholic Truth Societies," and that our suggestion implies "a reflection on the excellent work of our Catholic Truth Societies." We protest—no; we had no such intention. The editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW greatly values coöperation in the cause of truth, and would sacrifice all his little energy and possessions to further it. In fact he belongs to several Truth Societies, pays his dues pretty regularly, and does some other things to make truth popular. Of course, if a "Truth Society" were to play merely the part of supplying zealous stage-actors with means of advertising their personal merits, or if its managers gave occasional object-lessons in what literary men call "pirating," of goods made across the sea, we should call these efforts at disseminating truth, by sundry disguised violations of the divine commands, anything but "well directed." But it did not occur to us to criticise this sort of thing, because there are others who have a better right than we to exercise censorship in such

matters. What we did wish to urge by our otherwise harmless remarks was—a little more systematic and combined literary activity so as to create certain respectable and reliable Catholic repertories of information. One such, and a most needed and effective one, would be an exhaustive and representative Catholic encyclopædia, like Herder's *Konversations Lexicon*, or Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexion*, published by the same firm. That class of works produced by the combined and systematized activity of English-speaking Catholic scholars would enable every reading Catholic to answer promptly all the difficulties urged in matters of our holy religion; it would enable non-Catholic inquirers after truth to inform themselves at first-hand regarding questions of Catholic history and doctrine which are vulgarly misrepresented; it would leave no excuse open to the evil-minded journalist or the prejudiced encyclopædist or the bigoted teacher who cites statistics against the Catholic Church from popular non-Catholic works, knowing that the average reader has no means of verifying them, and that Catholics themselves could not refer the truth-loving inquirer to any standard work in our language which would give satisfactory information to a cultured man or woman. If we expressed the belief that such a work is quite as important a factor in creating and fostering right appreciation of the Catholic religion in America, and that it would effect more real good than a number of separate Truth Societies, we simply harbored a hope that must commend itself to every sensible and well-meaning Catholic.

And it is a hope that is not at all chimerical. It could easily find its accomplishment, if we united our scattered forces instead of localizing the interest around some individual energy which, however good in its place, might be diverted into a more powerful current, if it could be induced to merge its individuality in the larger channel for the general good. The English Catholic Truth Society is an example in point. It is a magnificent force doing untold good by printing and distributing an enormous amount of really first-class literature. It is a society unified, recognized by every parish in the United Kingdom and the Colonies; even the few local Truth Societies in Ireland and other parts, created for secondary purposes, coöperate with the main body, which has its

centre and directing boards in London. If the literary activity of English and Irish Catholics at home has not as yet produced a work such as has been suggested, and for which a need was felt long ago, it is due, we venture to say, to the fact that besides a literary contributing force there is needed a large financial force. There must be a sufficiently large reading public to encourage a publisher to undertake the task of furnishing the first outlay. Such a public might be found in America. In numbers we are not deficient, nor in the habit of reading, nor in that general intelligence which is capable of appreciating the value of correct information on historic and moral topics.

True, the capacity of appreciating such works is not yet an appreciation of actual value to a publisher. But we Truth Society leaders and editors and writers might utilize this capacity to educate our intelligent reading public to the practical appreciation of something more solid than stories and glorifications of our little mutual benevolent schemes. It was with this object that we began publishing THE DOLPHIN, and Pope Leo's classical verses in classical translation. THE DOLPHIN was labeled for "educated Catholics." The critics, even the best-intentioned and those engaged in raising the tone of Catholic reading matter at their own personal sacrifice, met us half-way by saying—very loud—"My dear DOLPHIN, you are trying to swim up in the air. We have no *educated Catholics* in this country. The rich have made their money and their comforts by a jump at fortune; they have no taste for solid reading, if they know how to read at all. As for the few respectable and really educated people amongst us, they having failed to give their attention to money-making, are too poor to buy your high-toned literature. We tell you, you will die!"

But we did not die; and we found a daily increasing number of serious, educated Catholics all over the land; first the religious, and then others. And now our Protestant universities, and the public libraries have found out that Catholic literature is not so meagre, that Catholics have something serious to say all the time in behalf of their position; and so THE DOLPHIN is in demand on the reading-table and on the public news-stands. Even if we had not found a welcome from a sufficiently large number of

high-minded readers, we should still have kept on with THE DOLPHIN, for its purpose was to create a taste, as far as possible, which might not very largely exist, but which was very desirable, and would materially aid the work of propagating Catholic truth. And with this in view we not only made a free offer to some of our Catholic societies that they might utilize matter which appeared in the REVIEW or in THE DOLPHIN and which was otherwise copyrighted, whenever it seemed desirable; but we also reprinted for others, who asked us for such service, at our expense, thousands of tracts and pamphlets to be distributed by them at their own discretion, or which they might sell to the profit of their cause at a nominal cost.

But we have said enough to explain our attitude toward Catholic Truth Societies that are really such. One word more, about what seems to us an unreasonable sensitiveness to criticism which is directed, not for the purpose of wounding or depreciating any individual or any class of active workers in the Church, but with the single view of dissipating mists which hinder us from getting a proper estimate of our position toward those whom we must either convince or repel. Such criticism, even if it humbles us, is a gain if it makes us aware of our weakness before an enemy makes us aware of it by inflicting a wound upon the delicate spot. Active literary life and priestly activity should mean very little for good, if we were to confine ourselves to attacking open enemies of the faith whilst catering to the conceits of those who look to us for leadership in battle. Surely a general gains nothing by abusing his soldiers, but he gains much by keeping them alive to the danger that comes from disorder in the ranks. The generation with which we have to deal knows its virtues only too well, and somehow not only claims all the virtues of its ancestors but talks forever of the glorious future of this hopeful Republic as if it were all done in advance by ourselves. It is very true that none of us has a right to set himself up as a corrector of his brethren, although the priestly commission limits or rather directs that principle of charity in certain cases; but we take the criticism of an editor when he recognizes a defect which hinders the straight movement in his own ranks, and speaks of it to his brethren, to be without sinister purpose and applicable to

himself as to them. Religion in its general as well as in its restricted sense is a school of correction; and to be wincing at every intimation that we should clean our guns and practice uniformity instead of perpetually denouncing the poor heretics, who sin often in ignorance, is unworthy of our name.

We do not want to quarrel, or even seem to do so, with any one who wears the glorious badge of the Society of Jesus. To us the splendid traditions of the Sons of St. Ignatius are forever an unsuspected pattern upon which we should, as defenders of our holy religion, wish to regulate our conduct in public and in private. If at times we fail to recognize that noble inheritance in a token which claims the signature of the Society, the fault is not perhaps wholly ours. "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart" has been an organ of which every Catholic might justly be proud. Like *The Ave Maria*, it made its peerless aim of a distinct devotion the guiding star of its policy. But of late it has, unlike *The Ave Maria*, entered upon a new path, a certain aggrestive method which, if it begets success, robs it of that grand prerogative of true progress which is the distinguishing characteristic of the Society of Jesus. May the editor of *The Messenger*, who has inaugurated this new movement, pardon us if we say that the indications of sensational effort in his recent methods have made us conscious of the fact that since we miss the device "of the Sacred Heart" from the title of the *Messenger*, we miss also that gentle force of wisdom which is *pudica, pacifica*. To be a successful defender of Catholic truth it is not necessary to engage in attacks supported by exaggerated statements or demands. The solid and consistent activity of the *Civiltà*, *The Month*, the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, or the *Messager du Sacré Cœur* inspires respect by their dignified conservative methods, and *The Messenger* might easily do the same by a judicious but well determined policy. As it is, there is an evident lack of that strong reliance upon the force of truth which needs no exaggeration to produce effects for good. Clamor may frighten people, but it does not convert them. In the "Friars" and the "Appleton" controversy, as in that of the Klauder Catechism, the editor of *The Messenger* was undoubtedly on the right side; but in none of these cases did he, as chief defender of an excellent cause, show any remarkable sagacity, or

that deliberate appreciation of power which does justice to an opponent and seeks to convince those who are not also convinced by mere noisy appeal. This we say with conscious deliberation, and in view of all the utterances that lie before us of *The Messenger*, but also with a sincere and deep respect for the devotion and the honesty of purpose as well as the many excellent personal qualities of the editor, who has made himself responsible for the expressed attitude of *The Messenger* in these controversies. Happily our laity, those especially who read *The Messenger*, will not cavil at the utterances, even if they should discern the inconsistency of its methods. Nor should they; the magazine is in every other respect such a help for good, such a blessing to our people, that we would wish to see it in every home of the land. And if we have said aught to lessen the appreciation of its present conduct, it is rather in self-defence, and in the hope that *The Messenger* and THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW or THE DOLPHIN will have no antagonism, even if they should happen to differ on certain open questions.

HOLY COMMUNION IMMEDIATELY AFTER MIDNIGHT.

Qu. I have been asked to bring Holy Communion at 12 o'clock or at midnight to a person who is ill and has been so for several months. She cannot fast until morning. Before she came to this place the priest where she resided gave her Holy Communion after 12 o'clock at midnight. Can I do it? It used to be that this could not be done. Is there any recent change in the matter?

Resp. There is no prohibition against giving Holy Communion under the above mentioned circumstances. The contrary view seems to arise out of a misinterpretation of the rubrics of the Ritual. These state (Tit. iv., cap, 4 and 10, De Communione Infirm.) on the one hand that the sick who receive Holy Communion from motives of devotion, and not as an immediate preparation for death (Viaticum), must observe the fast enjoined upon all persons communicating through devotion. On the other hand the rubrics, prescribing the manner in which the Blessed

Eucharist is to be carried to the sick, forbid that it be carried about at night, except in cases of necessity (*l. c.*, n. 10).

This latter injunction is plainly intended to safeguard the custom observed in Catholic countries of carrying the Blessed Sacrament with a due show of outward respect in which the faithful of the neighborhood are expected to take public part. The Ritual speaks (n. 9) of a procession attended by the people (members of the Eucharistic Confraternity or others who are prepared to accompany the Corpus Christi borne along by the priest vested in surplice, stole and cope, with acolytes and clerics reciting aloud the processional psalms). This is the ordinary manner in which the Blessed Sacrament is carried from the church, whither the sound of the bell calls those who are free to go to the house of the sick. Others join on the way, and all by whom the Eucharistic King passes on His merciful errand, genuflect and salute by the way. At the house of the sick, some friend or neighbor, or a member of the Eucharistic Confraternity has prepared the linen, the lights, the crucifix; the little domestic shrine in the sick chamber is decorated, flowers are strewn along the way to the room, the sodalists chant the hymn of the Blessed Sacrament, and altogether the visit of the Real Presence is a solemn event for the people of the parish who assist.

Now because this befitting demonstration of reverence and devotion cannot ordinarily be made without disturbance and confusion, or only imperfectly during the hours of night, therefore the Ritual prohibits the public carrying of the Blessed Eucharist to the sick, unless they be in danger of death, that is to say, in cases of necessity, when the ceremonial which otherwise is a duty has to be dispensed with owing to the urgent need of the sick person. This is what the Ritual prescribes as fitting, and it is assuredly what we should expect,—a practice which should be maintained wherever it is possible.

But in non-Catholic or missionary countries the Church dispenses generally from this outward ceremonial, which is the custom in Italy or France or Spain, where open reverence is paid to the Real Presence; and her motive is again the maintenance of reverence, but in this case from a different point of view. The procession accompanying the Blessed Sacrament when carried as

Viaticum or for devotional reception to the sick, would elicit disturbance or at least a danger of irreverence from those who do not understand our service and faith. And the old "discipline of the secret" (arcanum), which was observed in the early Church to guard the honor of religion against Pagan ignorance and bigotry, has been introduced among us, and dispenses us from this particular obligation imposed by the Ritual. We therefore carry the Blessed Sacrament to the sick very quietly, that is, without open show of any ceremonial which is likely to attract attention.

Now, since the Church dispenses us from the observance of the public and solemn ceremonial with which the Blessed Sacrament is to be carried to the sick in Catholic lands, she also removes the ground on which the prohibition to carry it by night mainly rested. We are, so to speak, obliged always to carry it at night, that is, in a concealed way which avoids the public attention. So far as public ceremonial is concerned there is no difference with us between the hour after midnight and the hour of noon.

There may, it is true, be other causes which make it prudent to observe a certain measure of the traditional Catholic legislation, even where new circumstances warrant their being set aside; and hence it would not be advisable to regard a new practice as a new rule. But it is only reasonable to keep the principle in the foreground, and to remember that the Blessed Sacrament which might be given to a patient through devotion with the dispensation of the Sovereign Pontiff without fasting, should be given to one who desires to receive it fasting if the priest can bring it to him at a suitable hour. The hour may be *unsuitable for a procession*, but it is always *suitable for one in need or ardently desirous of the Master Comforter's Real Presence.*

And this is what nearly all our prominent theologians seem to admit when they allow that Holy Communion may be brought during the night at Easter time to those who cannot sustain a long fast—this even in countries where the public carrying of the Blessed Sacrament is customary and ordinarily obligatory. It may be objected that this is a case of the Paschal precept, which cannot be urged in regard to Communions of mere

devotion. Very true; but the precept of Paschal Communion binds only those who can fulfil it so as not to conflict with some other positive law. If, therefore, the prohibition to carry the Holy Eucharist at night bind a priest, except in case of necessity (Viaticum), then the patient is not responsible if it be not given to him at other times; he would have no more right or duty to ask for Holy Communion at Easter than if the priest were sick or absent. We believe, therefore, that, apart from prudential reasons in which discretion may dictate a special diocesan law, there is no objection on the part of the Church to our carrying the Blessed Sacrament at midnight to the sick who cannot fast, so long as the discipline of private administration of the Holy Eucharist for the sick in general has the sanction of the Holy See. (Cf. *Lehmkuhl*, Vol. II, n. 161; 2. *Ballerini-Palmieri*, Op. Moral., Vol. IV, Tract. X, Sect. IV, n. 174 and 175, edit. 1891.)

DOES A LEGACY LIQUIDATE A DEBT?

Qu. Joe Winsom, building contractor, who had borrowed several sums of money from Jerry, a distant relative, in order to carry on his speculations, dies unexpectedly. In his will, made two years ago, he leaves a sum equivalent to about half of the contracted debt to Jerry. The remainder of his estate, including a life insurance, is bequeathed to a sister and in part to charities. The will, which contains the usual formula: "after paying all my lawful debts," appoints as executors the resident parish priest and Jerry.

The question I wish to ask is this: Does the sum bequeathed to Jerry by the term of the will liquidate part of the debt contracted by the testator; or is Jerry entitled to the bequest over and above the sum which he loaned to his departed relative? Jerry, himself, says that Winsom, the contractor, had shown him the will as a guarantee that, in the event of his death, Jerry would be secured against the loss of his money. But at the time this happened, the debt amounted to less than one-third of the nominal bequest; besides this it was secured by a mortgage of somewhat uncertain value. Afterwards Winsom borrowed more, and Jerry lent it to him without specific security, except a promissory note and the prospective success of the pending contracts. Winsom's sister and Jerry are not very friendly,

and there is a disposition to contest the relative claims. Both parties are, however, disposed to be advised by me. I should like to know what the law is likely to say, in case of litigation, but am more anxious about the moral view of the obligation devolving on me as executor on the one hand and spiritual adviser on the other.

Resp. "In equity, if a legacy equal or exceed the debt, it is presumed to have been intended to go in satisfaction; but if the legacy be less than the debt, it is deemed satisfaction for that amount." It is, however, an established fact that, as the Hon. Hugh Spalding sets forth in his formularies: "Courts allow very slight circumstances to rebut this presumption of payment: as where the debt was not contracted until after the making of the will; where the debt is unliquidated and the amount due not known; where the debt was due upon a bill or note negotiable; where the legacy is made payable after the debt falls due; where the legacy appears from the will to have been given with a different intention;" and in general, where the terms of the will express the intention of the testator that all debts and legacies be paid before or in addition to certain other provisions mentioned.

Now, since it is plain from the date of the will that the bequest was made before a debt to the same amount had been contracted, the court would in all probability interpret the intention of the testator to have been a purely benevolent one; that is to say, the legacy was intended to be a gift, partly in recognition of the kindly services of Jerry, partly in acknowledgment of kinship and friendly relations. For the fact that the bequest was made at a time when the debt (which might be supposed to balance it in part) was not only much less than the amount of the legacy, but was separately provided for by a mortgage, indicates that it was not intended as a collateral pure and simple against the debt.

Furthermore, the will states the intention of the deceased to bequeath the sums alloted to the various legatees "after paying all lawful debts," thus distinguishing between Jerry as a creditor and Jerry as an heir.

Such would be most likely the trend of a decision in an American court of equity, apart from certain State legal pro-

visions, as, for instance, where a legatee or heir is disqualified if named executor or witness, when a will is thereby rendered illegal, that is, void.

In conscience the executor may avail himself of the favorable provisions of the law. If, however, the known intention of the testator is frustrated by any accidental lack of legal formalities, the priest would still be not only justified, but even bound to use his legitimate and recognized influence with the contending parties to carry out that intention, yet so as not to effect any contempt for the legal formalities which the external order of things may require for the common good.

THE CARDINAL NEWMAN MEMORIAL.

It is with entire gratification that we act upon the suggestion of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, expressed in his subjoined letter to us, by opening in the pages of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN a subscription toward the Fund for the erection of a new church at the Oratory, Birmingham, the home of Cardinal Newman. In urging this noble project His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons writes to us:

BALTIMORE, January 2, 1903.

MY DEAR FATHER HEUSER,—

You are no doubt aware that Father Robert Eaton has received a mission from his superior, the Very Rev. Fr. Ryder, of the Birmingham Oratory, to solicit aid in the United States for the erection of a Memorial Church to Cardinal Newman. Perhaps there is no English-speaking prelate in the world whose name is held in higher veneration than that of the illustrious Oratorian. The number of those is legion who have entered the pale of the Church through the influence of his writings and charming personality.

I hope you will do all you can to make known and encourage Father Eaton's mission in the pages of the REVIEW and of THE DOLPHIN.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

No project could have been conceived to honor more effectually and nobly the memory of one whose name is a synonym for everything that appeals to the heart and intelligence of an educated Catholic speaking the English tongue. The proposal is not to erect a marble shaft, or a mausoleum, or a memorial hall, or a charity home, but a church where charity and love for truth and all things beautiful are to be taught and illustrated for generations to come. It is to be at Edgbaston, Birmingham, where the gentle Cardinal lived for forty years, training the men who are there now, and imbuing them with his own spirit of devout and literary activity, to educate thousands of others in the highest culture of which man is capable.

More than this. The church at Birmingham is actually a dire need. As a correspondent, apparently not a Catholic himself, but caught by the noble fitness of the design to erect such a church, writes in a recent number of the New York *Sun:* "I am of the opinion that there are a great many who would contribute to the success of the Rev. Fr. Eaton, of the London Oratory, who is in this country for the purpose of raising funds with which to build a Roman Catholic Church at Birmingham, England, as a memorial to the late Cardinal John Henry Newman, in which city the latter spent so many years after his conversion. I am told the Catholics of Birmingham are quite poor. Cardinal Newman needs no introduction to those who know him through his writings, and I think there are many non-Catholics who would contribute to such a movement if it were generally made known."

In another part of this issue of the REVIEW, Father Eaton himself explains the purpose of his invitation. The names of the American contributors will be published in successive numbers together with the amounts realized. Subscribers will address their contributions directly to Father Eaton, at his temporary residence in Philadelphia. It may stimulate interest in the noble undertaking to learn that the Catholics of England have already shown their appreciation of the great Cardinal's work which is being continued in the Birmingham Oratory. Among the leading personages who have made offerings thus far are:

The Duke of Norfolk, K. C	$25,000
Mrs. Poncia	5,000
Anonymous	5,000
Mr. and Mrs. Lacy	2,500
C. C. Shaw, Esq.	1,500
W. H. Watts, Esq.	1,250
Mr. and Mrs. Hall	525
P. A. Martin, Esq.	525
F. W. Ratcliff, Esq.	525
T. W. Allies, Esq.	500
Anonymous	500
A. Clarke, Esq.	500
Mr. and Mrs. Feeney	500
T. Gaisford, Esq.	500
T. F. Hope, Esq.	500
Captain Rushbrooke	500
15 Donations of $250	3,750
3 " " 150	450
13 " " 125	1,625
Smaller Donations	11,350
Total (up to date)	$62,500

We shall gladly follow in the wake of those who thus honor the memory of Cardinal Newman. The movement can be productive only of the highest good. The church built in memory of the great Oratorian will add to the honor of God by facilitating a more fitting worship in His temple; but it will also direct the attention of those who have a high regard for the noble qualities of heart and mind which distinguished him, to the one purpose for which he lived and to which all his aims tended—that is, the finding of true peace in the home of the Catholic Church.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. The Bible and Science.—Father Ferdinand Prat has contributed to the *Études* two articles[1] on the relative influence of progress and tradition on Catholic exegesis. He points out that the Catholic Bible student has to deal with a special form of an apparent opposition between science and faith, and that in order to do so successfully, he has to refurbish weapons supplied by the storehouse of tradition, but grown rusty through a partial disuse of centuries. St. Augustine and St. Thomas and the Council of Trent stated the Catholic principles of Biblical exegesis clearly enough; but almost immediately after the Council, when the famous Galileo case was considered by the Roman theologians, the Tridentine clause "in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine" was overlooked, and the Bible was practically regarded as a guide-book of scientific and historical research.

In the sixteenth century, Father Pereira[2] found in Genesis the whole of Pliny's natural history, of Aristotle's physics, and of Ptolemy's astronomy. In our own times, the Abbé Moigno believed that all the recent scientific discoveries were forestalled by the author of Genesis, and that the obscurity of several Scripture texts, which still remains, is due to the tardy progress of science. Here, too, belong most of the attempts of harmonizing the Bible with science, the name of which is "legion." Some of them stand refuted by their extravagance; thus, Le Pelletier[3] tried to show that Josue had added a day to the solar year by commanding the sun to stand still,[4] and that another ten days were added by Isaias' miracle on the sun-dial of Achaz.[5] The last-named of these miracles

[1] November 5, 1902, pp. 289–312; December 5, 1902, pp. 610–633.

[2] Bened. Pererii, Comment. in Gen., Romae, 1589.

[3] Astronomie biblique. Le Déluge, Josué, Ezéchias, curieuse concordance des trois plus prodigieux miracles de la Bible avec l'état present du ciel; Paris, 1867, 8vo, p. 39.

[4] Jos. 10: 12.

[5] IV Kings 20: 1–11; Isa. 38: 1–9; Ecclus. 48: 26.

has of late been explained in a more rational way by Professor Adolf Müller, of the Gregorian University, Rome.[6] The so-called Biblical cosmogony, too, has of late found an able exponent in the person of Professor Zapletal, of Freiburg, Switzerland.[7]

Albert Houtin[8] has certainly acted both cruelly and unfairly by throwing ridicule on these Catholic attempts to harmonize the Bible with our scientific and historical discoveries; there is no branch of knowledge that might be treated in the same way. At the same time, we cannot well endorse a system of exegesis which makes of Moses a Neptunian to-day, and a Plutonist to-morrow, according to the prevailing tendency of geology; which formerly viewed the inspired writers as adherents of Ptolemy, and now makes them forerunners of Copernicus; which, at one time, read in the first chapter of Genesis the cosmogony of Laplace, at another the hypothesis of Faye, and is now about to find in the same passage the theory of M. de Ligondès. And all these changes are not due to any discovery of new texts or readings; the discovery of the retrograde movement of the satellites, of Uranus and Neptune, and of the peculiar revolution of Phobos around Mars, and similar changes in purely secular sciences have occasioned all these passing phases in the field of Biblical exegesis. It is sinful to explain away a truth evidently contained in Sacred Scripture; but it is impious to pretend to find in Scripture a truth which God has not placed therein.

How, then, are we to remedy this evil? Father Prat is right in maintaining that no satisfactory solution of the difficulty can be found in the admission of Card. Newman's *obiter dicta*,[9] even were we to prescind from the question of their admissibility. Neither can we safely recur to Mgr. D'Hulst's theory of a mitigated form of inspiration in certain parts of the Bible which does not necessarily exclude all error;[10] we might as well try to bail out a boat

[6] L'arte gnomica e la Sacra Scrittura, studio apologetico sull 'orologio di Achaz, published in Memorie della Pontificia Academia dei Nuove Lincei, and also in Natur und Offenbarung, Bd. 48: 257–73; 340–55; 405–19.

[7] Der Schöpfungsbericht der Genesis 1: 1–2: 3. Mit Berücksichtigung der neuesten Entdeckungen und Forchungen erklärt. Freiburg, Schweiz, 1902; 8vo, v + 104.

[8] La Question Biblique chez les Catholics de France au xix. siècle; Paris, 1902.

[9] *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1884, p. 185 ff.

[10] *Correspondant*, January 25, 1893, pp. 220, 233.

by punching a hole in its bottom. Nor is there any need of declaring the position of the Catholic Bible student hopeless; the author who writes to this effect under the pseudonym Isidore Desprès[11] is prompted to do so more through wounded self-love than through love of truth.

Our true remedy is found in our return to tradition. Father Prat shows that St. Jerome regarded the Bible as a series of books whose expression and language were adapted to the readers of the respective ages for which they were written. They speak only of the sun, the moon, the morning star, and two or three constellations, so that they do not pretend to teach astronomy. They name only six metals, seven minerals, and fifteen precious stones, so that they do not pretend to teach mineralogy. About one hundred plants and one hundred animals are mentioned in the inspired books, so that they do not teach botany or zoology. In a word, the Bible is a religious book, or rather a collection of religious books, written in a popular style, in which scientific questions are not treated *ex professo*, but only by way of illustration, or as the medium of conveying higher truths. Father de Hummelauer, in his recent commentary on the Book of Josue, gives evidence that he fully agrees with the foregoing view.[12] Explaining the passage which tells of the standing still of the sun,[13] and which has puzzled so many commentators and has elicited so many different theories, he regards the narrative as merely giving the impression of Josue and those engaged in the battle. They were so absorbed in their work that they did not notice the coming up of a hail-cloud, and therefore they mistook the ensuing darkness for the twilight of evening. When the cloud had disappeared or discharged its contents on the heads of the Amorrhites, the combatants were struck at seeing the sun still high in the heavens, and their impression of a miraculous occurrence was the natural consequence.

Thus far, then, the Bible is a collection of books which teach religious truth *ex professo*, and mention scientific truths only incidentally, as means of expressing religious truth. There can be no difficulty about the principle of Catholic exegesis with regard to

[11] *Revue du Clergé*, June 1, 1900, p. 17.

[12] Commentarius in Librum Josue, Parisiis, 1903, P. Lethielleux.

[13] Jos. 10: 12 sq.; p. 234 f.

the first class of truth; the teaching of the Church, or the analogy of faith, or similar theological helps, guide the Catholic interpreter. And there is no more difficulty about the principle of Catholic exegesis regarding the second class of truths, or scientific truths, incidentally mentioned in the Bible. The Tridentine and the Vatican Councils are sufficiently clear on this point, though their teaching regarding it is rather implicit then explicit. But St. Augustine and St. Thomas are both clear and explicit on the question. They distinguish two domains of truth—the domain of faith and that of science; in the former the infallible teaching of the Church and tradition rule supreme; in the latter we depend on the representatives of science.[14] To illustrate this principle by a real occurrence: In the Galileo case the Roman theologians made a mistake in urging in a purely scientific question the popular language of the Bible against the testimony of a scientific expert; on the other hand, it was not the least of Galileo's mistakes that in his turn he endeavored to explain his own theories into the Bible and to represent all other theories as opposed to the Bible, as if Sacred Scripture did not occupy a level wholly different from that of science, and raised above it.

But has not the Catholic student to show that Sacred Scripture in its incidental scientific remarks is not opposed to the certain results of science; and, moreover, must he not investigate on scientific principles whether certain events related in the Bible are miraculous or natural? All this is perfectly true, but in none of these questions can there be any real opposition between science and the Bible. The reason is as simple as it is cogent: in all these investigations the Bible student has to take the certain results of science for his starting-point; hence his final verdict can no more be antagonistic to science than the conclusion of a syllogism can be opposed to the premises. The reader may verify in the concrete the foregoing statements by perusing the interesting and learned articles on "The Magi and the Star," contributed to THE DOLPHIN[15] by Professor Joseph V. Tracy. The author never attempts to construct his scientific facts from the data of the Bible, but he studies the latter in the light of the

[14] Cf. *Études*, November 5, 1902, p. 303 f.; notes 1, 2, 3, and note 1 on p. 304, give all the references.

[15] December, 1902; January, 1903.

former. A similar process of reasoning may be observed in the Very Rev. L. C. Casartelli's study on the Magi, published in the *Dublin Review*.[16]

Father Prat has been able to draw up four canons that are to guide the Catholic commentator in harmonizing the Bible with science: (*a*) The points of contact between science and revelation are few, and their points of coincidence are fewer still. It is mainly in the field of philosophy that revelation and science either coincide with or touch each other. (*b*) Since it is not the primary object of inspiration to communicate scientific knowledge as such, a commentary which finds scientific theories in the inspired book implies an error and a danger; an error in principle, and a danger for future apologists and commentators. (*c*) Since the religious character of the inspired writers entitles them to employ popular language in their statements of scientific facts and principles, they ought not to be charged with scientific errors where a similar charge could not be brought against popular writers working without the aid of divine inspiration. (*d*) In purely scientific questions, a Biblical passage admitting of several meanings must not be explained so as to contradict the certain results of science; on the other hand, the natural and proper sense of Sacred Scripture must be adhered to until the results of science render a figurative explanation necessary.

2. The Bible and History.—Thus far we have followed Father Prat in restoring tradition to its proper rights in the interpretation of those Biblical passages that coincide with or touch the data of science. But now the author maintains, and in this he agrees with the express teaching of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, that what has been said concerning the Bible's relation to science must be extended to its relation to history. And if, owing to the fact that we have become accustomed to see the data of modern science carried into our Biblical commentaries, it has become hard for us to realize that the six days of creation are no more closely connected with the strata of geology than with Aristotle's categories, many more of us on first seeing Father Prat's principles extended to the field of history will be tempted to exclaim "this saying is hard, and who can hear it." The saying is hard indeed, since the

[16] The Magi: A Footnote to Matthew 2: 1. *Dublin Review*, October, 1902, p. 362 ff.

bond between history and religion is much closer than that between science and religion. But at the same time, the saying is of the utmost importance, seeing that the progress made in history is much more solid and extensive than the progress in natural science. If Hugo Winckler's *Babylonische Kultur*,[17] had been published before Father Prat wrote his articles, he would no doubt have referred us to this pamphlet in order to give us an idea of the advance in historical studies. Up to a few years ago profane history dated, at best, back to the end of the seventh century B.C., and continuous history began only toward the end of the sixth century B.C. Profane history covered therefore some twenty-five or twenty-six centuries. But owing to the modern discoveries, the beginning of modern history has been pushed back another twenty-five or twenty-six centuries, so that the former starting-point of profane history has now become its centre.

Before proceeding to investigate the precise bearing of historical discoveries strictly so-called, we must warn the reader that there are also Biblical discoveries which bear directly on the text of the Bible or its interpretation. To render our meaning clear, we need only draw attention to the recently recovered Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus which has been carefully edited by Professor Norbert Peters[18] and Father Knabenbauer,[19] to the recently recovered Syriac text of the Gospels, and to other similar finds. It would be unpardonable, were we to omit here the recent discovery of a Hebrew papyrus buried in Egypt, and dating from the first to the third century, A.D. According to present appearances, it is by far the most ancient Hebrew document extant, and as such is the object of the most intense interest. It contains the Ten Commandments and the so-called Shema, *i. e.*, Deut. 5 : 6–18 and 6 : 4–9. Mr. Stanley Cook, at the recent meeting of the British Society of Biblical Archæology, drew attention to the fact that this manuscript agrees in several points with the Septuagint version against the present Hebrew text. Thus after specialists shall have exploited the document in all its bearings,

[17] Leipzig, Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.

[18] Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus untersucht, herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit kritischen Noten versehen ; Freiburg, Herder, 1902.

[19] Commentarius in Ecclesiasticum cum Appendice ; Parisiis, Lethielleux, 1902 ; pp. i. lxxxiii.

the Biblical commentator will proceed with greater assurance in his judgment on the relative value of the Greek and the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

But recoveries like the foregoing are Biblical rather than historical. At present we have to do with the relation of the Bible to profane history strictly so-called. And in the first place, it should be noted that there is no reason why God should reveal an historical fact any more than a scientific fact. If we have been right therefore in maintaining that the Bible stated points of science only incidentally, as far as they are connected with religious truth, we must maintain the same position concerning historical truth as such. This view appears to be in full accord with the tradition of the Fathers and of the Synagogue. The latter divided the books of the Old Testament into the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, so that our so-called historical books of the Old Testament were partly classed among the Prophets, partly among the Hagiographa. History as mere history was not recognized. Hence it follows that our inspired books cannot be expected to contain complete histories of their respective periods.

Secondly, it must be expected that our inspired historical books are written in the peculiar style of their respective time of composition. On the whole it will not do to dogmatize on the special peculiarities prevalent in each particular book of Sacred Scripture; but if we divide the methods of writing history into three, that of compilation, that of elaboration, and that combining both, we shall see that the inspired historical books commonly follow the third or mixed method. In other words, the inspired historian sifts his documents with a view to the end he wishes to attain; he eliminates some, and combines, abbreviates, or reproduces others. We are not in the least prepared to agree with the Abbé Loisy's exaggerated views; but his four chapters on the parables in his *Études Évangeliques*[20] may illustrate the mixed method of writing history. Loisy believes that in the parabolic teaching of our Lord as set forth in the Synoptic Gospels we have indeed the original nucleus of Christ's own words, but overlaid by an Apostolic interpretation. In other words, the Synoptic parables are the seed not as it was cast by the Divine Sower, but in a condition in which it had already begun to germinate. As for us, we fail to

[20] Paris: Picard. 1902.

appreciate the reasons set forth in a recent Catholic review of Loisy's latest works[21] for emphasizing "the deep debt which Catholic Biblical students owe to him, whether they happen to agree with him or not."

In the third place, Father Prat shows quite conclusively that in our inspired historical books there occur so-called implied quotations, *i. e.*, that whole portions of these books are copied either from profane or inspired sources without any reference to the original document. Moreover, express references are more frequent in the later than in the earlier books; and still, it is not at all probable that the earlier books contain fewer quotations. Here then is a wide field for the critical acumen of the commentator. In certain instances, indeed, it may be easy enough to separate the original documents and to assign them to their proper source; but the majority of cases presents veritable riddles. By way of example, we may mention Dr. Radau's recent attempt to derive the so-called first account of the creation in Genesis, or Gen. 1, from a Sumerian source,[22] in which the Creation was represented as a natural process of generation. If the purely subjective element be taken away from this book, very few, if any, of Radau's conclusions will remain.

Fourthly, it is well known that an author does not always endorse the words he quotes. Hence the question, Do our inspired historians endorse their implicit quotations? Father Prat believes that we ought to defend the divine authority of all such quotations, whether they be known as such or not, until the contrary is proved. For this view of the case we may appeal to the unanimous voice of tradition.

Finally, to omit several rather minute investigations, it must be kept in mind that possibly, though not probably, some of our so-called histories may be mere allegories or parables. Father Prat mentions the Book of Judith especially; the reader knows that the Books of Tobias and of Jonas might be added; but here again tradition must be maintained till progress has rendered its position untenable. If this should ever happen, what would we lose? Here is Father Prat's answer: "From a religious point of view, nothing; from an historical point of view, very little."

[21] *L'Évangile et l'Église*, Paris: Picard, 1902; *Études Évangeliques*, Paris: Picard, 1902.

[22] The Creation-Story of Gen. 1; Chicago, 1902.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE PART OF RHEIMS IN THE MAKING OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE. By James G. Carleton, D.D., Assistant Lecturer in Divinity, University of Dublin. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1902. Pp. vii—259. Price, 9s. 6d. net. $3.15.

The English Bible of 1611, commonly called the Authorized Version, was far from being an original translation of the Scriptures. Its authors expressly state that they followed the Bishops' Bible as a general rule, but they add: "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text . . . : Tindale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's, Geneva's." It will be noted that they omit all reference to the original English translation, that of Wickliffe, as well as to the version of the New Testament published at Rheims in 1582 for the benefit of English Catholics. Dr. Carleton accounts, we think plausibly, for the first omission by the practical obsoleteness of Wickliffe's English, except for a few phrases which Tyndale had adopted. The other omission is more difficult to explain. For reference is made more than once to the Catholic translation in the Preface entitled 'The Translators to the Reader,' which comments on certain statements made in the Preface to the Rheims New Testament. Perhaps the true reason for silence may lie in the controversial disinclination on the part of the Protestant editors to admit that "any good thing" could "come out of the Nazareth" of despised and rejected Catholicism.

However that may be, it is now generally admitted by competent judges [*e. g.*, the compilers of the Revised New Testament (1881) in their Preface] that the Rheims version exercised a strong influence on the Authorized translation. It is the laudable object of the present work "to estimate and define, as accurately as possible, the degree of that influence."

In order to accomplish this design thoroughly the author has not only made exhaustive comparisons between the English Bible of 1611 and the Rheims version, but he has collated all the preceding translations, except Wickliffe's.

He begins his survey with an interesting historical account, admirable alike for its brevity, clearness, and wealth of material, of the earlier versions of Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Taverner, Cranmer, Whittingham, Tomson, that published at Geneva in 1560, and the celebrated Bishops' Bible, a revision of the Great Bible entrusted by Parker to episcopal scholars. He concludes the series with a ten-page account of the Rheims Testament, followed by a short history of the Authorized Version which owed so much to it.

Cardinal Allen's connection with the Seminary established at Douay in 1568 is well known. The College of Rheims was an offshoot of the older foundation, the professors and students (several of them graduates of the English Universities) having been compelled to remove from Douay to Rheims in 1578. They occupied their time by taking in hand, under the patronage of Cardinal Allen (whose reputation for Scriptural knowledge stood so high that he was chosen by Cardinal Carafa to assist him in his amended edition of the LXX intended to be a beginning of a complete version of the Latin Vulgate), an English translation of the New Testament for the use of Catholics. A letter by Cardinal Allen in which he dwells on the difficulty in preaching effectively owing to the only authorized version of the Scriptures being in Latin, and expresses his willingness to undertake "a faithful, pure, and genuine version of the Bible in accordance with the edition approved by the Church," has assigned to it by Dr. Carleton 1580 as its date. If this be correct, the scheme had already passed from the region of contemplation, for a marginal entry in the Douay Diaries of the year 1578 states that 'On October 16th . . . Martin, Licentiate (of Theology), began a translation of the Bible into English, with the object of healthfully counteracting the corruptions whereby the heretics have so long lamentably deluded almost the whole of our countrymen.' This controversial purpose of the new revision is also plainly set forth in the Preface (which condemns unsparingly the post-Reformation translations of the Scriptures), as well as in the general tenure of the notes. Gregory Martin, the chief author of the Rheims version, was a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, and a capable Greek scholar—an accomplishment of which he made use in his translation which, while designedly based on the Vulgate, was considerably influenced by a first-hand examination of the original text. This is especially evidenced by the number of cases in which the Rheims Testament inserts or omits the definite article, a point about which the earlier versions were conspicuously

careless. The other sources mentioned generally in the Preface include some of the English translations as well as 'other editions in divers language.' Bishop Westcott has pointed out how much stronger is the resemblance than the difference between the Rhemish translation and Tyndale's English Bible. The great disfigurement of the former is its multitude of Latin words which make it oftentimes rough and grotesque, when not actually unintelligible, *e. g.*, 'He exinanited Himself' (Phil. 2: 7); 'Against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials' (Eph. 6: 12); 'Odible to God' (Rom. 1: 30); 'The proposition of loaves' (Heb. 9: 2); etc.

The Translation with Preface and Annotations was published at Rheims in 1582. Many copies are still extant. A second edition, the same except for alterations in the notes, appeared in 1600. Finally, the complete Bible was published at Douay in 1609–10. The annotations on the Douay Old Testament from the hand of Dr. Worthington, the President, are fewer and less combative than those on the New Testament.

Turning next to the Authorized Version, Dr. Carleton considers it most probable that the compilers knew the Rheims translation through Fulke's contemporaneous work upon it. That writer printed in parallel columns the Bishops' Bible and the Catholic Version, and to this fact was 'due indirectly the degree of influence which the Rhemish Testament has exerted upon the construction of the English Bible.'

In the second section of his treatise, Dr. Carleton adopts the analytical method of demonstrating the important position of the Rheims Version, "as a liberal contribution to the storehouse of the English Bible," not only in its vocabulary, but in grammatical distinctness, and even in the structure of its sentences. His plan is remarkable for its thoroughness. In the first place, he compared the Authorized Version (designated A.) with the Bishop's Bible. When any difference appeared, he consulted the Rhemish Version (designated R.). If he found that R. agreed with A., he next examined the earlier translations, Cranmer's, the Genevan, etc. When none of these showed the rendering common to A. and R., he assumed that A. must have borrowed from R., and inserted the joint-reading in the first column of Table I, placing in the second column the readings of the earlier versions. He adopts the same methods with regard to the marginal readings of A.

The objection will at once be made that the similarity af the two

renderings may be no more than a coincidence. A. and R. may conceivably have gone to a common source, or independently have arrived at the same conclusion. But an examination of Dr. Carleton's exhaustive Table makes it plain that the arguments are so many, so repeated (sometimes verse after verse being identical), as to make it almost a certainty—the author, however, does not say more than that the evidence is presumptive—that the coincidences must point to a borrowing from one version by the compilers of the other.

To give a few instances in point:

(*a*) And first as to the influence of the Latin Vulgate derived from the Rhemish version. Some of the most striking instances are seen in Mark 4: 12, where "be converted" (convertantur) has taken the plaee of "turn;" in Mark 8: 19, 20, Luke 9: 17, John 6: 13, where "broken meat" is replaced by "fragments" (fragmenta); in Matt. 10: 26, John 1: 31, 14: 21, Rom. 2: 5, etc., where famine (fames) is found instead of the Saxon "dearth;" in Matt. 10: 15, 11: 22, where "more tolerable" (tolerabilius) is preferred to "easier," and 1 Tim. 4: 15, where "incontinent" (incontinentes) stands for "riotous."

Again, both Versions follow the Vulgate in reproducing a Greek word, *e. g.*, hymn, sycamore, austere, Areopagite, mysteries, schism.

A third way in which the Vulgate has filtered through R. to A. is seen in the literal translation of Latin phrases, such as "took care of him" (ἐπεμελήθη ἀυτοῦ) in Luke 10: 34; "be it far from thee" (Ἵλεως σοι) in Matt. 16: 22; "to make known the mystery" (γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστριον) in Ephes. 6: 19.

(*b*) *English instead of Latin words*, where R., contrary to its usual practice, prefers a Saxon word, or Saxon compounds, to their Latin equivalent. Thus we have "blessing" in place of "lauding" in Luke 24: 53; "stock" for "generation" in Acts 13: 26; "building" for "edification" in Jude 20; "stirred up" for "moved" in Acts 6: 12, etc.; and "taken away" for "exalted" in Acts 8: 33.

(*c*) *Modernizations*. So "moisture" is adopted by A. from R. in place of "moistness" (Luke 8: 6), "cutting himself" for "all to cutting himself" (Mark 5: 5), "outside" for "utterside" (Matt. 23: 25); "musick" for "minstrelsy" (Luke 15: 25), "distresses" for "anguishes" (2 Cor. 12: 10); and "adorned" for "did tyre" (1 Peter 3: 5).

(*d*) *Archaisms—e. g.*, "if haply" replacing "to see if" or "whether" (Mark 11: 13); "foretell" instead of "tell before" (2

Cor. 13 : 2); "without" instead of "out of" (Heb. 13 : 13); "thereof" instead of "of it" (Rev. 21 : 23).

(*e*) *Improvements.* As regards vocabulary, "came" (ἐλθών) for "went" (Matt. 4 : 13); "gather" (συνάγουσι) for "carry;" "worketh" (κατεργάζεται) for "doth" (Rom 2 : 10); "helps, governments" (ἀντιλήψεις, κυβερνήσεις) for "helpers, governors" (1 Cor. 12 : 28); and "repay" (ἀποτίσω) for "recompense" (Phil. 19).

In giving force to the Greek article, we read "the furnace" (Matt. 13 : 50); "the wind" (Ib. 14 : 30); "the truth" (Col. 1 : 5); "the heavens" (Heb. 4 : 14); "the . . . manna" (Apoc. 2 : 17).

Similarly, attention, lacking in earlier versions, is paid to the Greek particle δέ, *e. g.*, Mark 12 : 29; Luke 1 : 6; 18 : 15.

(*f*) *Changes for the worse, e. g.*, "the abundance" is no bettering of "superfluity" (Mark 12 : 44 and Luke 21 : 4); "full time" unduly emphasizes the earlier "time" (Luke 1 : 57); "might be rich" is an obvious blunder for "might be *made* rich" (2 Cor. 8 : 9) and "who now rejoice" for "now rejoice I" (1 Tim. 6 : 7).

Dr. Carleton descends to the letter N in his analysis of the points of agreement between the Authorized and Rhemish Versions, but we think we have shown sufficiently how well he has succeded in his object. His work is as thorough, exhaustive, and complete as the most exacting critic could demand. It is not a little interesting that a non-Catholic scholar should essay to prove with such ability and success, how much the Authorized Version (the cadence of whose rhythm Newman declared to have haunted him for years after his conversion) owes to the oftentimes despised Rheims Translation. Those who are never tired of lauding the one to the skies as the greatest monument of English literature, will not, we hope, after reading this elaborate treatise, forget in the future to give its due meed of praise to the Version that remains a standing witness to the attainments of our Catholic forefathers, which the compilers of the Authorized Version used so freely and thanked so sparingly.

PEPLOGRAPHIA DUBLINENSIS: Memorial Discourses Preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, 1895–1902. London: Macmillan & Co. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. viii—219. Price, 5s.

Under a not particularly illuminative title (at least to the unclassical reader) Dean Bernard has edited a series of discourses on departed worthies of Trinity College, Dublin, by their modern suc-

cessors. Dr. Dowden, the Bishop of Edinburgh, preaches on Archbishop Ussher of chronological fame; Professor Gwynn on the less well-known Bishop Wilson; Dr. Bernard himself on the famous Idealist, Bishop Berkeley; Professor Mahaffy on Bishop Stearne (a not very congenial subject); Professor Lawlor on Archbishop King; the Bishop of Derry, Dr. Chadwick, on Edmund Burke; Canon Sherlock on Henry Grattan; and Mr. Westropp Roberts on Viscount Falkland.

The figures chosen for homiletic praise are sufficiently representative. One misses at once Dean Swift and Oliver Goldsmith; but the editor consoles us in the preface by hinting that they may receive recognition at a future date.

Turning to Archbishop Ussher and Bishops Berkeley and Wilson as the best known among the ecclesiastics, and to Burke and Grattan as the most famous of the laymen, we find in each case a careful biography, giving the leading events of their respective lives, followed by an analysis of their characters, an enumeration of their virtues, and a catalogue of their good deeds, ending usually with a practical conclusion to the hearers to "go and do likewise" in their several degrees. Thus an account of Archbishop Ussher's prodigious learning, which acts as a foil to a narration of the prominent events of his life, leads up to the practical exhortation to Trinity men to imitate the thoroughness of his works by giving a full historical treatment, not a mere "perplexing patchwork of disconnected shreds and scraps selected from the rag-bag of second-hand learning," of the "several distinctive doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome."

Provost Salmon's monumental work on the *Infallibility of the Church* (of which some one has wittily said that from the destructive nature of its subject-matter, the *Fallibility of the Church* would have been a more appropriate title), comes in for special praise in this connection.

The discourse on Bishop Berkeley is remarkable for its clever summary of the chief features of the philosophy associated with his name. We have seldom seen a better exposition in the compass of so few words. "Berkeley declared," writes Dr. Bernard, "that when people speak of 'matter,' they speak of what no man can understand, for the word has no meaning at all. Sights and sounds, tastes and smells, these are the realities with which we are concerned; but to affirm the existence of something beyond and behind the qualities which can be perceived by the senses, is to use words without any

ideas corresponding to them, and this is the universal blunder of speculative writers, who 'first raise a dust and then complain that they cannot see.' "

But the learned Dean is surely carried away by admiration for his hero when he goes on to state that Berkeley's "relentless logic," whereby he demolished the thesis that matter apart from its qualities (and by qualities are meant the "proper objects" of the senses) has a real, objective existence, is "still unanswered."

The treatment of Burke and Grattan by their respective panegyrists is sympathetic and highly eulogistic. The former is praised by Dr. Chadwick for the brilliance of his literary style, the moving fire of his eloquence, the sage statesmanship of his political counsels. Incidentally, Trinity men will be interested to learn that he was the founder of the College Historical Society, analogous to the "Union" at Oxford and Cambridge. Henry Grattan's political life is divided into two parts—his attempt to obtain the independence of the Irish Parliament, and that to win the Emancipation of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. Both efforts were successful, the one temporarily, the other up to the present day. It is instructive and refreshing to find an Irish Protestant clergyman denouncing the "unblushing corruption" and the "treacherous policy" which brought about the Act of Union of 1800; and still more so to read in his pages that the penal laws were "utterly vicious and unjust." Canon Sherlock observes furthermore with "pardonable pride" that "Irish Protestants took the lead in this matter of Emancipation," and that "the students of Trinity College presented an address to Grattan (in 1795), thanking him for his exertions in the Cause, while the University itself was the first to open her doors and admit to her honors members of the Roman Catholic Faith." And he goes on to adorn his tale with a moral, especially useful in view of a recent burning controversy. "It still remains," he writes, "a reproach to the Protestants and the Legislature of the United Kingdom, that Roman Catholics are refused a University of their own: a refusal which Grattan more than a century ago denounced as an act of injustice, and a denial of Christian charity. I believe that this refusal is not by the wish of the great mass of English Protestants; it is certainly not by that of Irish Protestants."

This discourse is one of the ablest and most fascinating in the book. The others vary considerably in interest and merit. Professor Mahaffy, in particular, is not by any means at his best on a subject with which he cannot have much in common; and Mr. Westropp

Roberts' contribution on Viscount Falkland might have been omitted without any serious loss. But the book, taken as a whole, has many features of interest, and we hope it may be sufficiently successful to ensure the publication of a fresh series of illustrious *alumni* of an illustrious *Alma Mater*.

THE REVELATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By J. E. C. Welldon, D.D., Canon of Westminster Abbey; Lately Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India and Ceylon. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. vii—384. Price, 6s.

It is to be feared that devotion to the Holy Ghost does not form so important a part in the spiritual life as should properly be the case. The dearth of literature on the subject would, at least, point to that conclusion. Any work, therefore, even from a non-Catholic source, that attempts to bring home the nature and office of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, must be welcomed in so far as its theology is sound. Love springs from knowledge, and the more the mind knows of the Holy Spirit, the greater will be the attraction of the heart and will towards His blessed influence.

The treatise before us is in the main well calculated to produce this effect. It is purposely couched in non-technical language, and for that reason should find its way to the bookshelves of an intelligent laity averse to the abstract metaphysical subtleties of the school, who yet are eager to know the principles of a doctrine so practical in its bearing on the life of the soul as that of the Holy Spirit's presence and work in the world.

Having stated the scope of his work to be an examination of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles on the subject of the Holy Ghost, and thence "to determine what light it throws on the religious problems of the modern Christian world," Dr. Welldon begins by an elaborate exposition of Old Testament passages on (*a*) the creative or life-giving energy of the Spirit of God with reference to the physical universe, to man, to natural beauty, prosperity, and happiness; (*b*) the Holy Spirit as the author of intellectual ability in its various form —artistic, administrative, etc.; (*c*) the Holy Spirit as the author of prophecy; (*d*) the Holy Spirit as the author of holiness. The absence of His special designation as the "*Holy* Spirit," from the Old Testament (except for a passing reference in the Psalms), which appellative is constantly met with in the New Testament, is cited to illustrate the lower moral conception of His nature before the advent

of Christ. The list of texts quoted is practically exhaustive. Their general force is shown to teach approximately the Personality of the Holy Ghost as the author of life, "the interpreter of the Divine Will, the unique source of light and liberty." For, although the author hesitates to say that the Holy Spirit is as clearly taught in the Old Testament to be a Person as He is an energy, he is compelled later to admit that Isaias "speaks of the Spirit in terms so personal as to forbid the thought of . . . metaphor."

The subsequent chapters on the revelation concerning the Holy Spirit in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, make interesting reading, although hardly so full in treatment as the chapter which we have been considering. We would single out for special praise the lessons drawn from the simile of "the wind" in our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, viz., the mysterious character of the Holy Spirit, His regenerative action, and His consecrating influence. The analysis of the narrative, in Acts 2, of the events on the Day of Pentecost, is also well done. And the author rightly insists more than once upon the reality of the Holy Spirit's work in the world in changing the whole tone of morality, so that the grosser forms of sin, such as are described in Dr. Döllinger's *Das Heidenthum und Judenthum*,[1] once looked upon as natural and even connected with the religious rites of Isis and Aphrodite, have been banished from the sight of men.

The least satisfactory part of the book is that concerned with the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Christian Church. Bishop Welldon seems to have no conception of the indwelling presence of the Paraclete and Illuminator in the Body of Christ as its perpetual Teacher and Guide, the unfailing source of its grace and life. Yet we must in fairness admit that there is an excellent passage on the Power of the Keys, in which it is stated in language as plain as could be desired that, "according to our Lord's explicit promise, the gift of the Holy Spirit conveys to the Church as a body, and to her priests as her representatives, the power of pronouncing, or refusing to pronounce, the forgiveness of sins."

The value of the treatise is marred by the latitudinarian leanings of the author, shown notably in belittling the *Filioque* clause, in

[1] See, too, J. A. Froude's essay on *Origen and Celsus*:—"The world has never seen . . . such a condition of human society as prevailed in the Roman Empire . . . between the Crucifixion and the conversion of Constantine . . . Moral good and evil were fancies merely, with no bearing on life." Dr. Julius Koch in his *Roman History* gives similar testimony as to social conditions at the time of Augustus.

minimizing the extent of Inspiration, in making the true conception of the Atonement "analogical," and in ranking the dogma of Eternal Punishment among "stern beliefs characteristic of a worn-out theology." Although it cannot hope to take the place in any degree of Cardinal Manning's works on the Temporal and Internal Missions of the Holy Ghost—works as full of accurate theology as they are truly devotional—it may do some good in arousing interest in the Person and work of the Blessed Spirit of God among those who forget His Presence and gifts, and from forgetfulness fail in love and gratitude towards Him.

RICH AND POOR IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Orello Cone, D.D. London: Adam & Charles Black. Pp. viii—245.

This painstaking treatise on the teaching of the New Testament as regards the relation of rich to poor, may be best described, in the words of the sub-title, as "A Study of the Primitive-Christian Doctrine of Earthly Possessions." In a preliminary chapter, Dr. Cone sketches the social conditions that existed among the Jews before Christ, and the main outline of Old Testament teaching on wealth and poverty. He adopts incidentally the position of the higher critics, represented by Dr. Driver, on the question of the authorship and dates of several of the Sacred Books, and draws extensively on German writers like Bertholet, Weizsäcker, and Buhl. Humane treatment of the poor is shown to have been strictly enjoined by the Levitical Law, notwithstanding the permission of slavery. God (or *Yahweh*, as Dr. Cone prefers to call Him) was regarded, in the words of Hannah, as He "who maketh poor and maketh rich."

In the following chapters, which form the best part of the book, Christ's own teaching concerning the social problem arising from poverty and wealth, is delineated exhaustively, in so far as the Synoptic evangelists are in question. For all reference to the Fourth Gospel is, for obvious reasons, conspicuous by its absence. Here, also, as in the earlier chapter, the author is too fond of digressions on the critical value of the sacred writings. So long as he confines himself to a summary of the point of view of Jesus as to the responsibilities and dangers of wealth and the dignity of poverty, he is admirable. He wastes no words; there are no purple patches of homiletic rhetoric; we feel, when we have done, that little remains to be said. We like particularly the allusion to the refrain of the Magnificat—one "that sounds throughout the entire Gospel" of St. Luke—the note of sym-

pathy with the poor; and the reference to Christ's own life of perpetual poverty. The remaining chapters on the Acts and the Epistles are of a slighter character and of a lower calibre. We cannot agree that St. Paul's "ascetic view of life, grounded on his doctrine of the flesh," combined with "limited perspective," tend to make his feeling towards the material concerns of the world, on the whole, one of indifference and depreciation.

The author cannot be followed in his exegesis of the parable of the "rich man," to whom God said, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee," and of Dives. He takes them, in conjunction with our Lord's hard saying—"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God"—to mean a condemnation of wealth *qua* wealth, instead of the *abuse* of wealth—a very different thing. Because money brings in its train a variety of temptations, its possessor finds the road to Heaven rougher than the poor man without *impedimenta;* but that does not make it impossible for a rich man to avoid a selfish use of his money. "Crescunt dona: crescunt etiam rationes donorum," as St. Gregory says; "when gifts increase, the responsibilities of gifts increase in like ratio." The man endowed with ten talents was rewarded with the charge of ten cities because he corresponded with his obligations, while his companion with five talents had to be content with a lesser reward. "To every one that hath shall be given" is a law of Gospel morality, and it is inexplicable on the hypothesis that the possession of wealth *in se* is sinful. Christ preached no socialistic creed. He was no popular demagogue denouncing capitalism as a crime, inciting laborers against their hirers—in an important parable (that of the Vineyard) He actually adopts, without a word of protest, the class distinctions of the age—the wage-earners against the moneyed aristocracy. He fed the multitude when they were hungry, but not by bidding them raid the neighboring towns. It is true that in the Beatitudes poverty is exalted, wealth depreciated; just as in the Magnificat the rich are "sent away empty," the hungry "filled with good things." But it is to miss the whole point of Christ's social teaching to apply such words to the mere *material* well-being of men. He never failed to preach the superiority of the soul over the body—the life of the spirit, immortal, eternal, over the fleeting life of the flesh. "Is not the life more than the meat?" is His pregnant question, giving the key to His entire doctrine. The reference in the Beatitudes is to a spiritual, not

a physical, state. Detachment from creatures, "emptiness" of all earthly gifts, brings with it a heavenly and unending reward. Christ made His own the maxim of an ancient sage: The truly happy man is not the richest, but he who can do with the fewest possessions. He fostered no radical or revolutionary upheaval of existing society. The poor were to be content with their poverty, the rich to make good use of their wealth. The one class had to bear in mind that they were not forgotten by God ("the cries of the defrauded entered into the ears of Jehovah"); [1] the other that, if their obligations were great, the reward for a right correspondence with them was greater; both, not to set their affections upon things of earth, remembering that "the fashion of this world passeth away."

A minor point of criticism is the unnecessary sneer at the Church's supposed change of front on the principles that govern usury.

The author concludes an interesting work with some wise words on the non-existence of a magic "cure" for the misery and sufferings of poverty. "The effective remedy will be found to be, not a new system, but a new spirit; and a spirit proceeds neither by magic nor by leaps and bounds."

CONTRIBUTION PHILOSOPHIQUE À L'ÉTUDE DES SCIENCES. Par Le Chanoine Jules Didiot, des Facultés Catholiques de Lille. Lille: Desclée. 1902. Pp. xiv—302.

Canon Didiot's name will probably be associated in the minds of many of our readers with a superior *Cours de Theologie*, constructed on the lines of a philosophical system and entitled accordingly *Logique*, *Metaphysique*, *Morale Surnaturelle*. The present work is a philosophical study of the notions underlying and pervading the sciences. It is not an elementary introduction either to philosophy or to the sciences, it is rather the complement of both,—an ontological and a psychological development thereof, addressing itself primarily to the professor and the advanced student. Its purpose is to contribute to the mutual conciliation of metaphysical and physical science by a thorough explanation of their common grounds and a clear presentation of their reciprocal obligations. The lines on which the study proceeds are the following:

The object matter, both of the sciences and of philosophy, is either some *being* or some form of *action* or movement. An analytic exposi-

[1] St. James.

tion of these object spheres constitutes the two main divisions of the work. Being, the first subject matter, is either substance or accident, infinite or finite. The finite is either spiritual or corporeal.

Corporeal *substance* manifests itself as composed of an undifferentiated principle, which is the root of quantity, extension and number, and a differentiating principle, the root of unity and activity. The complete individual substance is the supposite or person. *Accidental* being is realized most universally in movement, which is either mechanical and transitive from an agent to a patient, or vital and imminent in the agent producing it. With a synthetic exposition of the philosophy of vital activity, the first chapter of the book closes and the way is prepared for an analytic study of the nature of matter, living and non-living, the human person, and of higher spiritual being. In these "special questions" the theory of metaphysical being is seen in application to its more restricted physical environment. A parallel treatment is accorded to the category of *action*, that is, the philosophy of action,—its elements, its kinds and laws,—is presented synthetically and then analytically pursued in specialized conditions, as physical, chemical, physiological, cognitive, and appetitive in man and as it is realized in the spiritual world transcending the human. It is these studies of metaphysical concepts in their physical setting that constitute the peculiar merit of the work and make it very much more than a synopsis of ontology, such as might be found in the average manual of scholastic philosophy. We select by way of illustration the treatment of organic evolution. The author shows that the philosopher and the scientist approach the subject from different standpoints, and find in it different problems. The philosopher is but secondarily concerned with the subdivisions, the genus and species, into which biology classifies living forms. The *plant* and the *animal* are for him the two *species* of the *genus organized body*. What he is primarily interested in knowing is whether these specific limits are or can be transgressed by the forces at work in nature. Has the mineral ever become a plant, or a plant an animal, or an animal a man? This is the question as philosophy views it, and the negative answer to which it finds not much difficulty in establishing, by an appeal, not to *morphology*, but to the *functions* and operations which manifest an essential difference between the various so-called kingdoms, or *philosophical species* of nature. The biological sciences, however, face another problem and view it from a different standpoint. What they want to know is whether *morphological* evolution is indefinitely possible; whether the

inorganic molecule has been able of itself to become a living cell; whether minerals have been able to transform themselves into plants, these into animals, and finally into men.

The physical sciences are interested in the range and processes of the evolutive power in nature. The investigations of comparative physiology and biology are useful to determine the conditions and variations of that power; but the importance of these factors must not be exaggerated, nor should it be supposed that reason and faith have been imperilled, if it should be demonstrated that an animal of a lower organization has been raised to the dignity of a monkey in the zoölogical army. The stages of progressive development in the embryo, the transition of obscure larva and nymphs into brilliant butterflies furnish authentic specimens, philosophically harmless, of these morphological changes, the importance whereof for the philosophical and religious interpretation of the origins of the living world are not infrequently exaggerated.

Philosophy would love, indeed, to have clear information on the reasons and conditions of the evolutive power at work in nature. Unfortunately, it must be content with guesses at the riddle, and wait till the sciences furnish fuller data. It may well be, however, that the solution will be found in the *spontaneity* of the intrinsic vital movement. Spontaneity under favorable conditions increases the perfection of the living being. Contrariwise, if it be thwarted, or restricted by unfavorable conditions. Vital spontaneity always develops for *good* or for *ill*. If for good, the result is never the specific *transformation* of the organism, neither from a lower to a higher nor from a higher to a lower genus, or species. If for *ill*, the result again will not be a transformation of nature, but a gradual exhaustion and death. And so, the author concludes, evolution occurs solely within the limits of the accidental, and never transgresses the essential.

The foregoing brief sketch of the treatment of the evolutionary problem may serve to suggest at least the purpose and method of the book as a whole. It brings to the front matters that are common to philosophy and the sciences. It differentiates carefully their distinctive view-points, and it indicates the ways in which they are mutually supplemental. It may be too much to expect, though it were earnestly to be hoped for, that non-Catholic philosophers and scientists will pay much attention to the work. The Catholic student and professor, whether of theology, philosophy, or science, however, and

indeed every cultured mind that feels an interest in the unification of knowledge, should give the volume a careful study. It does not, of course, contain the last word on its subject, but it is a distinctive and a valuable contribution thereto.

VIRGIL'S ÆNEID. Edited by Henry S. Frieze. Revised by Walter Dennison. Books I-XII. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company. 1902. Pp. 328. Half-leather, 12mo. Price, $1.50.

CICERO'S LAELIUS DE AMICITIA. Edited by Clifton Price, Ph.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company. Pp. 158. 12mo. Price, 75 cents.

Both these books are primarily adapted for use in the class-hall, and are each accordingly equipped with the pertinent apparatus of notes, illustrations, etc. We call attention to these here as convenient aids to the student who has outgrown the pupilage period, yet still cherishes a love for the Mantuan singer and the Maestro of Latin speech. The point of excellence in this edition of the Æneid is that it presents in convenient size and large clear letterpress the entire epic, together with abundant annotations, and an adequate vocabulary. It is, therefore, just the volume the lover of Virgil will want to have near to hand on his reading-table.

The present edition of Cicero's *De Amicitia* commends itself for its copious notes, its handiness, and material attractiveness. It lacks only a vocabulary to make it a perfect and independent *vade mecum.*

Literary Chat.

McMurry's *Special Method in Reading*, of the "Complete English Classics," gives valuable assistance to teachers in the treatment, particularly, of primary reading and oral recitation of stories. Catholic teachers may deem it wise to make other selections than those which are currently considered specimens of the best literature in our language; but they will profit their pupils if they note the superior methods in vogue in many of the common schools. Teachers in Religious Communities require this suggestive help all the more because the very earnestness and concentrated activity to which their lives are given, confirm them in certain traditional methods of reading and reciting which never strike them as peculiar or weak, because they are accustomed to them in those to whom they have looked up for similar instruction. Everybody is familiar with the sing-song style of some of the convent-grade performances, which, like certain national modes of inflection in reading and speaking, per-

petuate themselves unconsciously. If it be argued that this is only a matter of secondary importance, provided we attend to the education of the intellectual faculties and of the heart in the training in Christian principles ; or if it be urged that the peculiarity of elocutionary exercise is unavoidable, because the nuns living in community and apart from the public cannot be expected to have those habits of popular address which belong to the platform or stage,—we should answer that, if the perfection of public utterance is of secondary importance as an endowment of character, it is, like all external manner and form, a very powerful and therefore important means of attracting those whom we would influence by those gifts of character which education is supposed to develop. And that in itself is a part of perfect education.

The last number (Vol. XXXII, part 3) of the *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* contains an interesting sketch of "Derry Columkille," that is, the old "oak grove" in the midst of which the Saint established his monastery in 546, and where now stands the city whose inhabitants still religiously honor the memory of the holy founder by displaying the "oak leaf."

Sands & Company have just published *Anchoresses of the West.* The same firm has in press *The Monasteries of Great Britain* (with appendix for America) by Francesca M. Steele, who formerly wrote under the pseudonym of "Darley Dale." An article in this number of THE DOLPHIN, entitled "Prisoners of Love," which deals with the history of Recluses, is by the same author, who is already known to our readers by her *Convents of Great Britain* (Sands & Co., London, and B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.).

The Clarendon Press (Oxford) announces the fourth volume of the Oxford History of Music—*The Age of Bach and Handel*, by Sir Hubert Parry. The work is likely to prove of special interest to students of sacred music.

The Althea, published from the Convent of the Holy Child at Sharon Hill, maintains its unique character as a school publication. The originality, freshness, and exquisite taste, shown alike in the contents and form of the magazine, are the best indication of the superior training given by the nuns, who made a singular record in England for thoroughness in educational work.

Two new Dictionaries of the Irish Language are in preparation and likely to be issued in the course of the present year. Father Dinneen's work, already spoken of, is expected to be ready in the fall. Mr. O'Neill Lane, of Limerick, is engaged upon an English-Irish Dictionary intended to be helpful to students who wish to translate English works into modern Irish (*The Gael*).

Dr. Atkinson, President of the Royal Irish Academy, is being badly criticized by the Irish scholars of Germany. It appears that the recent edition of the Brehon Laws, made by Dr. Atkinson, is full of glaring mistakes, showing a lack of Irish scholarship. Mr. Whitley Stokes, who writes in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, drawing attention to the errors of the edition, is warmly seconded by Professor Zimmer, Nuno Meyer, and other Continental Celtic students, and the Brehon Law

Commission is being urged to take steps to have the edition subjected to revision. In this they are supported by other members of the Academy and men of unquestioned authority on such matters, such as Dr. Edmund Hogan, and Father Peter O'Leary.

Professor Gardner's *Ancient Athens*, recently issued by the Macmillans, is probably the most satisfactory work on an historic subject—becoming daily more popular, that we possess in any language. It avoids the lengthy quotations from threadworn authorities, and gives the reader an accurate and direct impression derived from exact knowledge enlivened by personal observation. The author was, for some years, Director of the British School at Athens, and also Professor of Archæology in London University, and his information is first hand. The volume is well-illustrated, for the most part by Athenian artists of ability.

The *Divina Commedia* is at last being translated into Welsh, with illustrations by Mr. Edwards, the Welsh artist, who has gone to Florence for the purpose of sketching original sites in the old haunts of Dante.

We have a communication from Mr. Montgomery Carmichael, who has been called the first living English authority on the subject of St. Francis of Assisi. Mr. Carmichael takes exception to our criticism of his exquisite translation of the *Sacrum Commercium*, or rather of his Preface, in which, after referring to the fact that the author of the original work used the Latin Vulgate for his Scriptural quotations, Mr. Carmichael says—"To be faithful, therefore, I could not take my quotations straight from the 'Authorized Version.'" This expression which conveys the idea that the reader of a distinctly Catholic work might expect a translator to use the Protestant "Authorized Version," seemed to us a needless apology, and one undignified in a Catholic translator, even if we allow that this mediæval gem in its translated form would appeal to enlightened Protestants not less than to devout Catholics. Mr. Carmichael protests against our interpretation. That he is a Catholic deeply attached to his faith is evident from his published works, notably his Introduction to that charming (though fictitious) history of the inner Life of John William Walshe, the English edition of which was reviewed in these pages some months ago. Nevertheless it remains a fact that the Protestant "Authorized Version," whilst its English rhythm and choice of expression is in many ways superior to the Challoner version presently in use among Catholics, is in all respects, except its doctrinal mutilations, a mere reproduction of the Catholic Rheims or Douay translation, made some years before the King James version. The reader will understand this better if he refers to a work published recently at Oxford and discussed in this number of our magazine: *The Part of Rheims in the making of the English* (*Protestant*) *Bible*, by Dr. Carleton. Hence, a Catholic scholar who feels scruples on literary grounds to use Dr. Challoner's revision, made a hundred years ago, and which while doctrinally more accurate is less melodious than the English version of King James, might without explanation go back to the old Rheims or Douay versions from which the King James translators took most of the good style which they kept in their "reformed" revision.

Mr. Magnus MacLeal's *The Literature of the Celts, its History and Romance*, is announced by Blackie and Son (London) as a good reference work for students of Celtic literature.

One of our most versatile writers, Dr. James J. Walsh, undertakes to vindicate Professor Richard Garnett's view of the much maligned Pope Alexander VI, the justice of which has been questioned by Mr. William Roscoe Thayer. Garnett is keeper of the British Museum and has means of information which ordinarily balance the judgments of historians. We understand that the Appletons have arranged to accept Dr. Walsh's unprejudiced version of this subject for the new edition of their Encyclopædia.

The first number of the *Review of Catholic Pedagogy*, edited by the Rev. Thomas E. Judge, promises well. The articles are excellent, though the programme must necessarily be tentative. We shall follow its development with interest and keep our readers informed regarding important utterances which may make for a unification of our educational interests.

Speaking of Frederick Harrison's volume on *John Ruskin*, supposed to be the best of the books thus far issued in the "English Men of Letters" series (Macmillan), a keen critic in *The Expository Times* writes: "There is one curious and particular weakness in the book. It is this: Mr. Harrison writes, not as a man of letters, but as a man of a certain religious persuasion. He gives us to understand that there are just two classes of religious people in the world, Positivists and Calvinists. He himself and August Comte and John Ruskin (as it turns out) and a few others are Positivists; all the rest of the world are Calvinists." And, as Mr. Harrison would have it, "it is a dreadful thing to be a Calvinist, though there are degrees of dreadfulness in it. One of the worst kinds is a Bible Calvinist. John Ruskin's mother was that." To find Mr. Harrison claiming Ruskin as a Positivist almost touches the grotesque. But we find Ruskin expressing his religious conviction rather summarily in a passage in *Præterita:* "I grew daily more sure . . that the only constant form of pure religion is useful work, faithful love, and stintless charity." That of course is the essence of what religion requires from man; but it is not yet religion, if it lack the spirit of conformity to the appointed law or method of the Creator and Judge who endowed man with capacity for useful work, faithful love, and stintless charity, for a definite purpose. The recognition of this principle marks the difference between the "Religion of Humanity" and the Religion of Christ.

The current number of the *Cæcilia* publishes as musical supplement *Vesperae in Festo Sanctae Familiae Jesu, Mariae et Joseph*, by Professor Singenberger. The music is arranged for choral service and suits admirably not only for the feast of the Holy Family but also for other festive days at the afternoon service, where the Canonical Hours are not officially enjoined.

It is well known that writers on spiritual subjects often do their best work when under stress of illness. A comfortable bodily condition, whilst it heightens the animal spirits to a certain degree prompting facile expression—and thus facilitating certain kinds of artistic activity—does not allow the finer or nobler traits of the soul to operate. This operation requires a sort of refinement; and refinement is allied to a chastening self-restraint which creates the temper of sacrifice and superiority to selfish or earthly motives. Work produced under such conditions bears the semblance of its

origin. We detect it in the ring of the very sentences, even as the purity of silver speaks from the sound as it falls. Some of Father Faber's writing which he did with head swathed in bandages and under racking pains, or of Henry Perreyve, consumed with fever and pain in the chest, are examples.

But it happens also that writers on secular and imaginative topics find sickness a good driver of the higher powers. In this case the concentration upon literary or artistic work serves as a relief from pain. It is not the "when-I-am-weak-then-am-I-strong" of St. Paul, but rather the spontaneity of mind made operative by the will which dominates the inconveniences of the body. A very recent case of such activity told in Harper's Literary Gossip is that of Elinor Glyn, the author of *The Visits of Elizabeth* and quite lately of *Reflections of Ambrosine*. She tells how she came to write, without any idea of publishing: "I was ill with rheumatism and felt sad not being able to walk, so wrote to divert myself, taking my ideas from old journals of mine that my mother had kept, which I used to write for her when visiting about when I was a girl."

The Harpers are to bring out a new edition of Jacob Abbott's *Gentle Measures in the Management and Training of the Young*, which gives valuable suggestions as to the proper use of discipline in school and home.

A third edition of *The Harmony of the Religious Life* will soon be issued, with some slight changes and additions.

The press is at last doing justice to the young King of Spain, whom the revolutionary newspaper agents succeeded in maligning but a short time ago. It now appears by the best testimony that Alphonso is one of the most accomplished youths, both in qualities of mind and heart and in the external graces, that has ever honored a throne, or, we might say, even a noble home. We had some time ago a most attractive account from the domestic physician of the royal household (N. Y. *Independent*); and now there appears in *Harper's Bazaar* an account of his training, by Luis de Figuerola Ferretti, Chamberlain of the Royal Palace. Both authorities agree in picturing the royal youth as one of the most attractive figures in the domestic history of our age. Much of the grace and sweetness of his temper is due to the education given him by a mother who is queen not only in rank, but in character and heart as well. She has trained him personally as only a mother could who sees in her child not merely an object of affection, but who from the first moment of his existence understood the great responsibility which awaited him, should he become king. She knew that only in a complete realization of these responsibilities and a mastery of them could the boy find his future happiness, and so she kept the model ever before her and him. It is a splendid object-lesson for Christian mothers of to-day.

It has been suggested that the publication of a series of analytic studies of the more serious among the living Catholic writers in English would be a most desirable boon for the general reader of high-class literature. Not only would such an analysis lead to a correct appreciation of the works which have made an impression on the educated public at large, but it would serve also as a guide to teachers and instructors

n English literature who are expected to discriminate in the choice of the books they put into the hands of their pupils, and who are naturally desirous to recommend Catholic authors, if their style and thought should commend themselves as being on a level with the best in modern classics generally. Among the authors who have made a name by their writings that ranks them among the literary élite of our day are Dr. Barry, Bishop Spalding, Francis Thompson, Father Sheehan, Mrs. Meynell, Miss Guiney, Miss Repplier, and a few others, all of whom excel not so much by the voluminousness of their contributions to current literature as rather by the choice quality which has been recognized as separating them from the common run of popular writers.

A reviewer in the literary column of *The Independent*, commenting upon Mr. Mark Baldwin's recent volume entitled *Development and Evolution*, pertinently remarks that there can be no fruitful discussion of "evolution" without keeping separate and distinct the different meanings to which the terms explaining or describing it lend themselves. With "laws" enough, and "principles" enough, and a plentiful supply of phrases such as "social heredity with transmission," "intergenetic concurrence," "genetically and phylogenetically," "physicogenetic, neurogenetic and psychogenetic," it is easy to exhibit any set of facts as illustrations of natural selections, or "evolution by orthoplasy," or any other "principle." The "principle" becomes as plastic as the number of the beast, and is used with something of the same logic. We thoroughly agree with the critic. What we need in the exposition of practical science, especially when it is applied as a test of moral and religious principle, is clear definitions. Therein lies the superior merit of the scholastic method in its fundamentals. It uses terms with a distinct, intelligible, and exclusive meaning, so that once that meaning is properly apprehended, argument becomes logical and conclusions are drawn which are perfectly safe, if made in order, which is the purpose of the much abused syllogistic form.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

SIXTEEN REVELATIONS OF DIVINE LOVE shewed to Mother Juliana of Norwich, 1373. With Preface by George Tyrrell, S.J. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1902. Pp. 231. Price, $1.00.

VETERA ET NOVA (Old and New). By Rev. N. Walsh, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. (New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.) Pp. 368. Price, $2.00.

THE FAILURE OF RITUALISM. Being a Letter to an Episcopalian, showing that Ritualism is Protestantism; also Editorial Observations. By B. F. De Costa. New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company. 1902. Pp. 30.

INSTRUCTIO PASTORALIS Raymundi Antonii Episcopi. Jussu et auctoritate Rmi D. Francisci Leopoldi, Episcopi Eystettensis, iterum aucta et emendata. Editio Quinta. Friburgi Brisg.: Sumptibus Herder. 1902. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Pp. 620. Pretium, $2.85.

THE EUCHARISTIC MONTH, or Thirty-one Days' Preparation and Thanksgiving for the Holy Communion. Useful to Priests and all who communicate often. Translated and Revised by a Catholic Clergyman. To which is added: Devout Entertainments on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar; also the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on the Most Holy Eucharist. New York: P. J. Kenedy. 1903. Pp. 267.

THE SHROUD OF CHRIST. By Paul Vignon, D.Sc. (Fr.). Translated from the French. With nine Photogravure and Collotype Plates and thirty-eight Illustrations in the Text. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902. Pp. 170. Price, $4.00.

CHRISTUS- UND APOSTEL-BILDER. Einfluss der Apokryphen auf die ältesten Kunsttypen. Von J. E. Weis-Liebersdorf, Dr. Phil. et Theol. Mit 54 Abbildungen. Freiburg im Breisg., St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Gr. 8vo. Pp. 124. Preis, $1.50.

ÆLTESTE LATEINISCHE UEBERSETZUNG DES BUCHES BARUCH. Zum ersten Male herausgegeben von Dr. Gottfried Hoberg, Prof. Universität Freiburg. Zweite Ausgabe. Freiburg im Breisg., St. Louis, Mo: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 91. Preis, $1.25.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS. By Saint Thomas Aquinas. Being a translation from the Latin of two of the minor works of the Saint. Edited with introduction by the Very Rev. Father John Procter, S.T.M., Ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. St. Louis, Mo: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 488. *This work was reviewed in our January number (English Edition).*

DE DEO-HOMINE (Tractatus), sive De Verbo Incarnato. Auctore Laurentio Janssens, S.T.D. 2 Pars: Mariologia—Soteriologia. Ex Summa Theologica ad modum Commentarii Aquinatis Summam praesentis aevi studiis aptatam. Tomus V totius operis. Friburgi Brisg.: Sumptibus Herder. 1902. Pp. 1021. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price, $4.25.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI Sacrique peragendi in usum Cleri Dioecesis Indianapolitanae. Ex Apostolica Concessione juxta Kalendarium Cleri Romani Proprium dispositus. Pro Anno Dom. Communi MCMIII. Indianapoli: Typis Corman et Harrington. 1902.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

LES GALLA: Grande Nation Africaine (dits d'origine Gauloise). Un peuple antique au Pays de Ménélik. Par P. Martial de Salviac, Missionnaire O. M. Cap. Deuxième Édition. Ouvrage couronné par l'Academie Française. Paris: H. Oudin, Éditeur. Pp. 355. Ord. 8vo. Illustrated. Price, 7 frs. 50 cts.

THE LIFE OF JOHN WALTER WALSHE, F.S.A. Edited, with an introduction, by Montgomery Carmichael, Author of "In Tuscany," etc. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902. Pp. 266. Price, $2.00. (*The English edition of this volume was reviewed in the September number of this magazine.*)

THE GATHERING OF BROTHER HILARIUS. By Michael Fairless. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1901. Pp. 171.

REV. MOTHER M. XAVIER WARDE, Foundress of the Order of Mercy in the United States. The Story of her Life, with brief Sketches of her Foundations. By the Sisters of Mercy, Mt. St. Mary's, Manchester, N. H. Preface by the Rt. Rev. Denis M. Bradley, D.D. Boston: Marlier & Co., Limited. 1902. Pp. 287. Price, $1.25.

LIFE OF SAINT PHILIP NERI, Apostle of Rome, and Founder of the Congregation of the Oratory. From the Italian by Father Bacci of the Roman Oratory. New and revised edition. By Frederick Ignatius Antrobus, of the London Oratory. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Vol. I, pp. 392; Vol. II, pp. 445. Price, $3.75 *net.*

ROME AND REFORM. By T. L. Kington Oliphant, of Balliol College. In two volumes. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp.— Vol. I: xxi—541; Vol. II: xvii—508. Price, $7.00 *net.*

EDUCATIONAL.

THE HOLY FAMILY SERIES OF CATHOLIC CATECHISMS. No. I. For the use of the First Confession and the First Communion Classes. By Francis J. Butler, Priest of the Archdiocese of Boston. Pp. 213. Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co.

THE MCBRIDE LITERATURE AND ART BOOKS. By B. Ellen Burke. Book 7. Pp. 257. New York and Chicago: D. H. McBride & Co. MANUALS FOR TEACHERS, corresponding to Books 4, 5, 6, and 7, of "The McBride Literature and Art Books." Pp. 37-42-60-55. New York and Chicago: D. H. McBride & Co.

A YEAR'S WORK AT THE WHITE HAVEN SANITARIUM of the Free Hospital for Poor Consumptives. By Lawrence F. Flick, M.D., of Philadelphia. Reprinted from *The Philadelphia Medical Journal.* 1902. Pp. 14.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR. By the Commissioners of Education. Vol. I. Pp. 1216.

THE WHOLE DIFFERENCE. By Lady Amabel Kerr. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Sands & Co. 1902. Pp. 363. Price, $1.60.

THE MORALS OF SUICIDE. Containing Part I: Reviews and Further Statistics; Part II: An Essay on Personality. By the Rev. J. Gurnhill, B.A., Scholar and Moral Science Prizeman of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Volume II. London, New York and Bombay; Longmans, Green & Co. 1902. Pp. xxi—220. Price, $1.75.

The PHOTO-MINIATURE. A Monthly Magazine of Photographic Information. Vol. IV, No. 43. *Photographic Chemicals.* New York: Tennant and Ward (London: Dawbarn and Ward). Price, $0.25. Per Year, $2.50.

VEXATA QUAESTIO, or, What shall we do with the Friar? A brief sketch of three Centuries of History in the Philippines. By W. Brecknock Watson. Part I. Manila: Impr. "Amigos del Pais." Palacio, 258. 1901. Pp. 44.

CONSTRUCTIVE AND PREVENTIVE PHILANTHROPY. By Joseph Lee, Vice-President of the Massachusetts Civic League. With Introduction by Jacob A. Riis. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co. 1902. Pp. 242.

EASY AND NATURAL METHOD OF SIGHT SINGING. For Self-Instruction and Class Use. By W. P. Schilling, Organist and Choir Master of St. Peter's Cathedral, Scranton, Pa. Published by W. P. Schilling, Scranton, Pa. Pp. 76.

THE PHILIPPINE FRIARS. Testimony from the Natives, from an able non-Catholic, and from one of themselves. Brooklyn, N. Y. City: International Catholic Truth Society, Arbuckle Building. Pp. 20. Price, $0.10.

THE KATIPUNAN. An illustrated historical and biographical study of the Society which brought about the Insurrection of 1896, 1898 and 1899. Taken from Spanish State Documents. Pp. 335.

FATHER TOM OF CONNEMARA. By Elizabeth O'Reilly Neville. Illustrated. Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally & Co. 1902. Pp. 394. Price $1.50.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—MARCH, 1903.—NO. 3

THE PRIESTHOOD.

IN a recent Apostolic Letter[1] addressed to the Clergy of Italy our Holy Father, Leo XIII, recalls to mind the grave duties that devolve upon the priesthood of our times to combat by example of life and by preaching and writing the errors of the age. The venerable Pontiff points out the moral and intellectual resources at the command of priests, and bids them remember and employ the magnificent prerogative of their position for the defence of truth. Under these circumstances it is especially opportune to reflect upon the singular dignity of the sacred ministry which confers both authority and grace.

"Open the eyes of the intellect," said our Lord to St. Catherine of Siena in one of her revelations, "and gaze at the Sun of Justice, and thou wilt see those glorious ministers, who through ministering the Sun, have become like to it, as I told you of Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. I say the same of these others who have administered in the garden of the holy Church the Light, that is to say, the Body and Blood of My only-begotten Son, who is Himself the undivided Sun, and all the Sacraments of Holy Church which all give life in virtue of the Blood. . . See then that these have taken on them the condition of the Sun, for, having clothed themselves and filled the power of their souls with Me, the true Sun, they become like to Me. The Sun illuminates them and causes the earth of their souls to germinate with its heat. Thus act My own ministers elected and anointed and placed in the mystical body of Holy Church in

[1] The Letter is written in Italian and dated December 8, 1902. A translation of it will be found in another part of this number.

order to administer the Sun, that is to say the Body and Blood of My only-begotten Son, together with the other Sacraments, which draw life from this Blood; this they do in two ways—actually, in administering the Sacraments, and spiritually by shedding forth in the mystical body of Holy Church the light of supernatural science, together with the color of an honorable and holy life, following the doctrine of My truth . . . *So thou seest that they are the Sun, because they have taken the condition of the Sun from Me, the true Sun; because through the affection of love they are one thing with Me, and I with them, and each has given light in the Holy Church according to the position to which I have elected him.*" [2]

In these words the great mystic, with the insight which characterizes such saints, declares the central idea of the Christian priesthood. We are familiar with the oft-repeated objection of the Reformers to sacerdotalism, that it involves an intrusion between God and man; but the very essence of the office in the New Testament is contained in its identity, actual and complete, with the office of Him who is a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedeck. It is not an addition to the priesthood of Christ, a new mediatorship, but the means "whereby He is able also to save forever them that come to God by Him: always living to make intercession for us." "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you," are His own words to His Apostles. It is the Catholic teaching that the priestly office is contained in the Apostolate. It is true that in the earliest ages of the Church a certain delegation or devolution of definite duties to an inferior class of ministers took place, who became known in time by the distinctive name of priests; but this new order, thus created, did not lose its Apostolic character, but retained in common with the superior order of the episcopate, the more precious and spiritual gifts of the Apostolic Order. And these gifts are precisely those which emphasize the mission of our Lord to the individual soul. In the great multitude of priests, then, the office is shorn of its universal character. The "solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum" is by the same ordinance rendered incapable of transmitting to others the same powers, but by that very means confined more closely to the great work of the

[2] Dialogue of St. Catherine, translated by Algar Thorold, pp. 251–3.

salvation of souls. This is the work of Christ, and this is the work in which is centred the whole idea of the Christian priesthood.

"It appertains to the office of the priest," says the *Pontificale Romanum*, in the office of Ordination, "to offer sacrifice, to bless, to preach, to baptize." These powers set up a twofold relation in the possessor; on the one side he is brought into contact with the real body of Christ in Holy Mass, the Sacrifice of the New Law, and on the other with the mystical body of Christ, His Church, in the administration of the Sacraments and the ministry of the Word. This twofold relation determines the position of the priest both to God and the people. He kisses the altar, which is the figure of Christ, the Victim of propitiation, turns round to the people and says "*Dominus vobiscum.*" But he does not stand midway between God and the people, as if in his own person he were mediating, but he is drawn into and identified with Christ, the only Mediator. In his relation to the real body of our Lord, he, while changing bread into the flesh of Christ, is himself changed into Him, and then he, one with Christ, has to change the people into Christ. "My little children," said St. Paul to the Galatians, "of whom I am in labor until Christ be formed in you."

In Baptism we are incorporated in the Church, and the character which is imprinted on the soul is not merely a seal, setting it apart, and consecrating it to God's service, but is an active principle, the living root which will put forth branches to bear fruit, or rather it is the ingrafting into the one root which is Christ, in order that the branches may bear fruit. In ordination the priest is made one with Christ, and the sacerdotal character is the communication of the power of Christ by which the recipient is able to work divine things. Through the baptismal character the baptized are put in the position to receive further gifts, but through the priestly character the power of Christ is able to work the communication of His gifts to others. In both cases we have an incorporation with our Lord, but in the first the relation arising is passive, in the other it is active. But it is to be noticed that the powers thus imparted are not ends in themselves, but means to participation in the inner mystic life of the body of Christ.

All life and growth consist in change until the corruptible

shall put on incorruption and the mortal immortality; and the life of the Church is no exception to the rule. Her growth is "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ . . . from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity." (Eph. 4.) This inner life, which thus runs through the mystical body, is the life of grace and charity. It is fed by the Blood of Christ, in whom, to adopt the Apostle's interchange of figure, all the building being framed together, *groweth* up into a holy temple in the Lord. (Eph. 2.) Now the great powers of the sacerdotal character are just those which have the closest connection with this life and growth of the Church. Primarily this connection of the priest with the Church is instrumental; that is to say, so far as direct action is concerned, he can only give rise to this life and feed its growth by means of the Sacraments, where the part he plays is instrumental in the strictest acceptation of the term. Being a free agent he can, it is evident, administer the Sacraments or not at pleasure, but the influx of grace, of life, through them is not under his control to increase or diminish as he may think fit. He is tongue and hand of Christ, who uses these instruments to work the wonders of His grace in the souls of the faithful. Thus he is made one with the scource of all power in the spiritual order, with the Author of that life which has its centre in the Sacred Heart, and thence flows and pulsates through all the members of the mystical body. Thus the priest's professional aim becomes identical with the aim of our Lord, his motive is the same, his work is the work of Him who prayed for priests, saying: "Sanctify them in truth. Thy word is truth. As Thou hast sent me into the world, I also have sent them into the world, and for them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth . . . And the glory which Thou hast given to me, I also give to them." (John 17.) The great reality then which is implied in the Christian priesthood is this absorption into and identification with our Lord, so that we

can say of the priest what was said of our Lord, "that he loved the Church and delivered himself for it that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the leaven of water in the word of life, that he might present to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. 5.) This is the great sacrament or mystery of the priesthood of the New Law.

This identification of the priesthood with that of Christ makes the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews stand out in a new light. The contrast between the Jewish sacrifices, with their multitudinous rites, and the one Sacrifice of the Christian dispensation, which is so plainly declared in that Epistle, is seen to require the prolongation of that priesthood by means of the imposition of hands. Every well-instructed Catholic knows that the words which the priest uses, the actions which he performs, are not his own but our Lord's. But non-Catholics too often fail to grasp this truth, and even Catholics, perhaps from over-familiarity, do not sufficiently penetrate its inner meaning. Not only is our priesthood one with the priesthood of Christ, not only is our office His office, but the life which it creates and nurtures is His life. It is that life of grace which will in the end become quickened and glorified into the one single life that, springing out of the eternal life of the Trinity in Unity, will make all things one in God. "I in them and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John 17.) We can indeed only just touch the fringes of the mystery of the supernatural life of grace, but we know that it exists, we know the change which it works in the soul, and we know that the priest is associated with our Lord in the production and fostering of this life. It is the inner bond of unity which is manifested externally in the coördination of all under the visible headship of Peter. Just as the family is bound together by the tie of common blood, so the mystical body of Christ is "compacted and fitly joined together," by the one life of sanctifying grace. Nay, more than this; just as the human body with its many members is animated by the one soul—the source of its energy, and the reason of its unity—so this body of Christ, though of many members, is yet animated and energized by the one life which is found in absolute plenitude in the head, Christ our Lord, alone.

By the exigencies indeed of our composite nature those members who want the fulness of life last on in the visible body of the Church until they either submit themselves again to the vivifying influx of grace, or, when the reaper comes at harvest, are separated as cockle from the wheat and cast into the fire to burn. But those who in the fullest sense are members of the body of Christ, live by that identical life of grace which overflows from the fulness of the grace of Him of whose plenitude we have all received. "Now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners; but you are fellow-citizens with the saints, and the domestics of God, built upon the foundation of the *apostles* and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. 2.) Through the apostolic priesthood it is that the body of Christ grows and gathers new members and the kingdom of God gains new citizens. It is the one reason for its existence that the inexhaustible treasures of the grace of God should be poured forth more and more abundantly.

The formation of Christ in the souls of men is therefore *the* work of the priest. In this he is the instrument of our Lord. The power which he uses, through which he acts, is not his own, but divine. It is, however, observable that the efficiency of what he does is much increased by the *conscious* subordination of his mind and will to the mind and will of Him in whose name he acts. It was St. Paul who said: "Such confidence we have through Christ toward God; not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves as ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God, who also hath made us fit ministers of the New Testament, not in the letter but in the spirit." (2 Cor. 3.) It must of course never be forgotten that the sanctity of the priest is not an essential or necessary part of the efficacious administration of the Sacraments; but looking at his work as a whole it is an undoubted fact that in proportion as the priest, who has been incorporated into our Lord by his sacerdotal character, is more and more united to Him by the spiritual union of grace, so does his mission become more and more productive of result. It is quite easy to dissociate sanctity and the priestly office, because they are separable, but very disastrous, because nothing so tends to render sterile the work of a priest as this separation.

The apostolic character then is inherent in the priesthood. He who receives it becomes thereby charged with a mission, to represent Christ before the world, and what is more to reproduce Christ in the world. We may use in this sense the words of the great Apostle: "I live; now not I, but Christ liveth in me." He partakes of the Messianic office; he is aggregated in a measure to the headship of Christ; he receives a commission to sit by His side and that of His first Apostles, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. It is therefore evident that the ideal of the priesthood must necessarily be contained in the closest union with Him who Himself said, "And the glory which Thou hast given me, I have given to them: that they may be one, as we also are one; I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John 17.)

It would perhaps be out of place to dwell further on this point, but it will not be inopportune to point out how in this matter the sacerdotal character is not to be distinguished from the baptismal character. A few words will suffice to make the parallel between them clear. In the case of Baptism there are infused into the soul principles which possess indefinite possibilities of expansion and growth towards a perfect realization of Christian holiness. In the case of Ordination there is imparted to the soul a share of the powers of the apostolate which carries with it the intrinsic power of building up a more and more perfect reproduction of the active sanctity of our Lord who was sanctified in truth. (John 17: 19.) If the eyes of faith can trace the outlines of all Christian virtues in the newly-baptized child, so can they trace in the newly-ordained priest the lineaments of those virtues which go to form the equipment of the ambassadors of Christ. According to the teaching of St. Thomas (3a. q. lxiii, *passim*) the sacramental character is a spiritual power, a participation in a greater or less degree according to the sacrament received of the priesthood of Christ; and this indelible spiritual power works continually, where impediments are not placed in its way, to the full realization of its end, which is to be conformed to Him who is the brightness of the glory of God, and the figure (*i. e.*, χαρακτὴρ) of his substance. (Heb. 1: 3.)

The Church, the body of Christ, is not only the recipient and

custodian of divine revelation, but it is, especially through the *charismata* of truth and sanctity, an objective showing forth of the beauty of that revelation. In our Lord the eternal beauty of God standeth, to use the words of the Canticle of Canticles, behind the wall of our humanity, looking through the windows, looking through the lattices; in His mystical body, the same beauty, communicated to it through Him, shines forth ever more clearly. "We all," says St. Paul, "beholding the glory of the Lord with open face are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. 3.) We read that when Moses came down from the Mount, his face shone from the conversation of God, so that he was obliged to put a veil on his face when he spoke to the people. The priest comes from God to the people; and his face should shine from the conversation of God. But in the new dispensation which is in spirit and in truth, it is not necessary to cover the face with a veil, for God has come face to face with His people in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the priest, the *alter Christus*, represents to the people Him who veiled the exceeding brightness of His divinity by humanity, and in veiling revealed it the more manifestly.

FRANCIS T. LLOYD, D.D.

Oscott College, Birmingham, England.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.

III.

I HAVE said that Irenæus is our greatest witness to the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol. The disciple of Polycarp, he is but one step removed from St. John the Evangelist; hailing from Asia Minor, Bishop in Gaul, he is the connecting link between the East and the West. Before citing his testimony, however, and that of Tertullian, some notice must be taken of Harnack's singular opinion, alluded to in a footnote to the last article. This view of the Rule of Truth cited by Irenæus is part of Harnack's general theory regarding the origin of the Symbol, and cannot profitably, or indeed at all, be dealt with apart from it.

Also, we must take account of the methods and mental equipment of the man.

Harnack has said his last, or rather his latest, word on the origin of the Symbol in an article written for the third edition of Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, which has been translated into English and brought out in book-form by the Rev. Stewart Means.[1] Splendidly equipped, as this distinguished German writer is, in respect of mental gifts and scholarship, he yet lacks some qualifications that are simply indispensable to the one who would trace the origin of the Symbol. He lacks the gift of Faith, to begin with; he lacks the conception of the Church of Christ as one in all nations—One Fold in which there is one Faith and one Baptism; and he lacks the knowledge, or, at any rate, the realization of the fact that the Symbol was not first given in writing, nor handed down from one generation to another in writing, nor suffered to be put at all in writing until the Discipline of the Secret began to be relaxed. As a consequence of these deficiencies, there are some things that Harnack does not see at all; and, in the case of the things that he does see, he not infrequently magnifies what is trifling in itself, and makes little of, or ignores, what is important. Groping in the dim light of those early ages, he reminds one of the blind man in the Gospel whose sight was being given back to him, and who at first saw "men as trees walking." In short, Harnack lacks the clearer insight which Faith gives, and he lacks the sense of perspective which would enable him to see things in their true proportions.

Let me give a few instances in point from the little book before me. At page 4, Harnack says: "Indeed, the Eastern Church has at no time traced any creed to an Apostolic origin." This is a case of ignoring positive testimony. The Fathers of the Eastern Church will be cited later on in rebuttal. At page 27, he draws attention to the position of "remissionem peccatorum, resurrectionem carnis et vitam aeternam per sanctam ecclesiam" in the Creed of the Carthaginian Church. Here, being dim of vision, he mistakes the baptismal interrogatory for the Symbol. The heretics, says St. Cyprian, from whom the words

[1] *The Apostles' Creed*, by Adolf Harnack. London: Adam and Charles Black. 1901.

are taken, "lie in the interrogatory when they say, 'Dost thou believe in the remission of sins . . . through the Holy Church?' since they have not the Church."[2]

At page 17 we read: "I cannot, however, convince myself that twelve divisions [of the Creed] were originally intended. No one who wanted to construct a creed with twelve articles in three main divisions would be so clumsy as to divide into 1 + 7 + 4, or rather 2 + 6 + 4." It is pretty safe to say that twelve divisions were not directly intended; but indirectly or incidentally, they were. In building the fabric of their Creed on the lines of the Trinitarian Formula laid down for them by the Master, the Apostles found it needful to use seven explicit words in telling all that was to be told about the Word of the second article, and four more to describe the Spirit of the third, His work, and His gifts to men. The result is that what was originally 1 + 1 + 1 became 1 + 7 + 4. Had they been guided solely by a sense of symmetry, like Harnack, the 1 + 1 + 1 would have issued in tetrads, thus: 4 + 4 + 4. As it is, the Apostolic Symbol, comprising twelve articles, which the German Rationalist, looking at it from an architectural or æsthetical point of view, finds so unsymmetrical, has ever edified and still edifies Faith. And Faith in its fulness has a symmetry of its own. The Author and Finisher of it, too, who is the Architect of this our earthly dwelling, uses Faith as enshrined in the Symbol to build Himself a stately mansion—"a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." It is not symmetry of form but adaptability to a purpose that is looked for in an instrument.

At page 15 we read: "The Greek text [of the Old Roman Creed] must be regarded as the original, for at Rome the Symbol was for a long time used only in Greek. It was not until long after the Greek text was in use that the Latin text was adopted as a parallel form." According to Harnack himself the Symbol was the Baptismal Creed of the Roman Church from the middle of the second century, when he supposes it was drawn up. Now, while large numbers of the converts in Rome even in the days of St. Paul were Greeks, as appears from the last chapter of his *Epistle to the Romans;* and while Greek was largely used by the

[2] *Ep. ad Magnum* (Migne, tom. 3, col. 1144).

lettered among the Christians in the first centuries, as is shown by inscriptions found in the Roman Catacombs; the fact remains that the language of the Roman people was never any other than the Latin,[3] and that many, not to say the greatest number, of the candidates for baptism were unlettered, and spoke no other tongue than the Latin. Therefore the Roman Church must have used the Symbol in Latin from the first. And the Latin form must have existed from the first side by side with the Greek form. Harnack, in this case, ignores the fact that the Symbol was not given from the first, nor transmitted, in writing. And he forgets that the catechetical and confessional use of the Symbol antedates the liturgical.

But is it quite certain that even the Greek text of the Roman Symbol existed before the Latin? that the Roman Symbol, when first committed to writing, was written in Greek? It is not; it is a probable or plausible conjecture; perhaps not even that. The text of the Symbol of Marcellus of Ancyra, which Harnack points to in proof of his statement, can not be accepted as proof, for two reasons. The first is that the original text of the Symbol of Marcellus has not come down to us. That which has come down to us is found in the pages of Epiphanius,[4] who wrote in Greek, and of course would cite the Symbol in Greek. It is more than likely that Marcellus, had he written his Confession of Faith to Pope Julius from Ancyra, would have done so in Greek. But he wrote in Rome, after a stay in that city, as he tells us himself,[5] of one year and three months—quite long enough to enable him to present his Confession of Faith in the language of the Latin Church, if he were so minded. But there is another and more cogent reason why we cannot take the text of this Symbol of Marcellus, which would be the earliest known, as proof that the Greek text of the Roman symbol was the original one. The Symbol of Marcellus is not the Roman Symbol at all. How is this shown? It is shown by the testimony of Marcellus himself, who declares distinctly in his Letter to Julius that he got his Sym-

[3] Cf. *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, Auctoribus R. Cornely, S.J., *et. al.*, (Editio altera), vol. I, p. 382.

[4] *Adv. Haer.*, lib. 3, Haer. 72. (Migne, P. G., tom. 42.)

[5] Migne, P. L., tom. 8, col. 916.

bol from his forefathers in the faith;[6] hence not in Rome, nor in the West, but in Asia. And the Symbol itself witnesses to the truth of his testimony, for it ends with the words "ζωὴν αἰώνιον," which were not part of the Roman Symbol for many a long day after the time of Marcellus, but are found, in terms or equivalently, in the earliest Eastern Symbols. There still remains the text cited in the *Psalterium Athelstani.* But the MS. of the *Cod. Laudianus*, which embodies the Latin text, is earlier by well-nigh three centuries than that of the so-called Psalter of Æthelstan.[7]

At page 80, Harnack says: "That the Roman Church after the sixth century gradually let itself be separated from and finally robbed of the symbol which it had previously guarded so faithfully, is a striking phenomenon which has not yet had its causes clearly explained." As a matter of fact, the Roman Church never for one day let itself be separated from its Symbol, and never was robbed of it. What, then, happened? This is what happened. From about the beginning of the sixth century and for a period of some three or four hundred years, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed took the place of the Old Roman in the *Traditio* and *Redditio Symboli.* This was owing to the spread of Arianism in the West. But the Roman Creed still remained in use in the baptismal interrogation, in the baptism of infants, as Burn shows at page 233 of the work already referred to, in the recitation of the Divine Office, and in private worship. When the shorter Symbol becomes once more the Baptismal Creed given to catechumens in the Roman Church, it is found to be no longer the Old Roman but the New Roman, or, as some prefer to regard it, the Gallican Symbol, which is identical with the Apostles' Creed of to-day.

If we are to measure Creeds with a tape line; if we are to distinguish one from another by the lesser or greater number of words they contain, Harnack is, to a certain extent, right. But if the true way to measure Creeds is by their meaning, by the articles of Faith which they embody, then Harnack is wrong, ridiculously wrong. The twelve articles of the Rule of Faith need not be of exactly the same length, like the twelve inches that make up the carpenter's rule. Faith is not reckoned in feet and

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Cf.* Burn, *An Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 199.

inches. The second article of the Nicene Creed contains almost as many words as the twelve articles of the Old Roman Creed.[8] But the Fathers of Nice could have said with truth that the second article as expounded by them was no longer than before. Exposition sets forth more clearly and defines more accurately the meaning of a statement, but does not alter it, nor add one iota to it. The best way to show how lack of perspective has led Harnack astray here is to place side by side the Old Roman Creed and the Apostles' Creed as we have it to-day. The additions to the former, which are in every case but an explicit setting forth of what was implicit, are put in italics.

Old Roman Creed.	Apostles' Creed.
(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty ;	(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty, *Creator of heaven and earth ;*
(2) And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,	(2) And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord,
(3) Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,	(3) *Who was conceived* of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,
(4) Crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried ;	(4) *Suffered* under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, *died, and was* buried. *He descended into hell ;*
(5) Rose again the third day from the dead ;	(5) the third day He rose again from the dead ;
(6) Ascended into heaven,	(6) Ascended into heaven,
(7) Sitteth at the right hand of the Father,	(7) Sitteth at the right hand of *God* the Father *Almighty*,
(8) whence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.	(8) whence He shall come to judge the living and the dead.
(9) And in the Holy Ghost,	(9) *I believe* in the Holy Ghost,
(10) the holy Church,	(10) the holy *Catholic* Church, *the communion of saints*,
(11) the remission of sins,	(11) the remission of sins,
(12) the resurrection of the flesh.	(12) the resurrection of the body, *and the life everlasting.*

It may be remarked, in passing, that this division of the Creed into articles, being that of the Old Roman Creed, should be

[8] The Creed contains 57 words, the article 54, by actual count.

regarded as the true one, although it is not the one generally given by theologians. The words added to the first article are clearly implied in "Almighty"; "born" of the third article implies "conceived"; "crucified" of the fourth, "suffered" and "died"; "buried," the descent into "hell," seeing that the soul as well as the body is to be assigned its locus. "God Almighty" of the seventh article serves but to identify the Father at whose right hand Christ sitteth, with the "Father" of the first article. Expounding the tenth article, which affirmed "the holy Church" merely in the African Creed of his day, St. Augustine adds, "Catholic, of course."[9] And elsewhere, in his exposition of this same article, he declares that "Church" is to be understood here, "not only of that which holds its pilgrim way on earth," but also of "that which in heaven ever cleaves to God."[10] The words "communion of saints" have thus been inserted to indicate that the "Church" signifies the Kingdom of God in its widest sense. Finally, the adjunct "life everlasting" defines the true meaning of "the resurrection," which is not a resurrection unto a mortal life, but a resurrection unto a life without end.

All this is very plain and simple to one who sees with the eyes of Faith. But Harnack's eyes were holden; he could not see it. And so, having no rule but the tape line to measure Creeds withal, he has committed himself to the unhistorical and astonishing statement that the Roman Church actually allowed herself to be robbed of her ancient Symbol. He marvels much how she could have done so, and seeks a solution of what is to him a puzzling problem. A Catholic child could easily have solved it for him.

There are other instances of inaccurate, misleading, and false statements in this little work of Harnack's, but the foregoing will be enough to show how unsafe a guide he is in tracing the Symbol to its origin.[11]

[9] *De Fide et Symbolo*, c. 10.

[10] *Enchiridion*, c. 56.

[11] There is one statement more, in a footnote at page 11, which must not go unchallenged. In reference to the legend that each of the twelve Apostles contributed an article to the Creed, he observes: "The Roman Catechism has nevertheless retained it." The Roman Catechism has done nothing of the kind. The compilers give as an alternative explanation of the name Symbol having been bestowed, as they

It is now time to say a word about Harnack's own theory of the origin of the Symbol, and to deal with his attempt to prove that the Rule of Truth cited by Irenæus was neither a Baptismal Creed nor identical with Tertullian's Rule of Faith. Briefly, his theory is that the Old Roman Symbol was composed in Rome about the middle of the second century, and that it was not till the early part of the fourth century, when the Churches of the East, as he supposes, first came to know and value the Roman Symbol, that the formation of symbols began in the East. Before that time, the East, he maintains, had indeed an "old, flexible, christological rule," also "ceremonial or polemical formulas of belief in One God the Creater, and His Only Son Christ," but no "established baptismal confession of faith."[12] Now, this theory is simply pulverized by the testimony of Irenæus, if it be but fairly interpreted. Hence Harnack's attempt, by all the plausible arts of which he is master, to turn the edge of this testimony and save his theory from destruction. How does he set about doing this? He starts with the assumption that no fixed baptismal Confession of Faith existed in the East in the time of Irenæus. This he bases on the fact that none but fragmentary formulas, of a flexible character, are to be found in the early Christian writings of the East. Against this we set the words of Irenæus that "the real Church hath one and the same Faith throughout the world,"[13] and that, while the languages of the world differ, the tenor of the

take it, by the Apostles, that it was composed (conflata) of the combined sentiments of all (ex variis sententiis quas singuli in unum contulerunt), the other explanation being that it was to be a "tessera" or badge of the Christian Faith. Rufinus uses words which convey the same meaning as those of the Catechism in relating, not simply how the Symbol came by its name, but how it was composed by the Twelve —"in unum conferendo quod sentiebant unusquisque." In fact the compilers of the Catechism are but citing once more the ancient tradition given by Rufinus as to the origin of the Symbol. And they do not commit themselves so definitely as he does to the statement that each of the twelve Apostles had a hand in the composition of it. They simply say that the Apostles "drew out distinctly the most important points of the Christian Faith in the twelve articles of the Creed." And yet Harnack himself, at page 18, tells us that Rufinus "knows nothing about" the legend; "all that he knows is the common composition of the Roman symbol by the Apostles soon after Pentecost and before the separation."

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

[13] *Adv. Haer.*, bk. I, c. II.

Tradition is one and the same."[14] Where Faith is one and Baptism one there is but one Baptismal Creed. Why, then, those varied and fragmentary creeds? "For this reason," says the Anglican Blunt, "the creeds never occur in an unbroken form in the first centuries. They were committed to memory by the faithful, but never to writing, that heresy might not learn to simulate the faith."[15] It would seem that the *Disciplina Arcani* still withholds its secrets from Harnack. Nor does he appear to realize that one and the same formulary may serve now a catechetical or confessional purpose, now a liturgical; be used at one time as a token of membership and communion, at another as a test of orthodoxy. It is this last use of the Symbol of the true Faith that is brought prominently into view in the East during the second, third, and fourth centuries. As new forms of heresy arose, new adaptations of the one and unchangeable Creed of the Church were devised to meet them, and we find St. Hilary bitterly bewailing this multiplication of "faiths" in his day.

Next, this famous German scholar and critic himself constructs a "confessional formula" out of fragments gathered from four or five different sources; and, as he was "enabled to make a similar conjecture in Justin's case, so it is probable that not only in Irenæus' time but also in Justin's" the formula so constructed "existed in the East." Now, this formula, fashioned, be it remembered, out of preëxisting material by Harnack himself, "Irenæus made the foundation of his *κάνων τῆς ἀληθείας*," or Rule of Truth. But it is probable that Irenæus had to incorporate in his Canon, before it reached its final completion, an "historico-christological formula of confession containing the sentences about the birth, suffering under Pontius Pilate," etc., because this latter formula "is perhaps, or even probably, to be distinguished" from the one that was made the foundation of the Rule of Truth.[16]

This bit of scientific guesswork is interesting, if not very instructive. But what does Harnack take Irenæus for? Does he take him for a fool that he should make him try to refute the

[14] *Ibid.*, c. 10.

[15] Blunt's *Theological Dictionary*, edited by the Rev. John Henry Blunt. Art. "Creeds."

[16] *Op. cit.*, pp. 63–64.

heresies of his day by the help of so crazy a piece of furniture as this patched-up formulary? And where is there room for conjecture when Irenæus himself still lives in his works, and is able to speak for himself? It is so far from being true that there is anything in the writings of Irenæus to show "that he is compiling" his Canon "independently out of a large number of fixed confessional formulas of the Church,"[17] that the very reverse is the case. Irenæus never cites this Rule of Truth, never appeals to this Rule of Truth, but as a something objective, a something quite independent both of himself and of those he is addressing, a something that existed in the Church throughout the world from the first, a something that was always and everywhere the same, a something, in fine, that had the authority of Apostolic institution. He declares that the Rule of Truth is bestowed "by Baptism" on every Christian, for Baptism alone gives a right to the Symbol. The description that he gives of it tallies exactly with that which Tertullian gives of the Rule of Faith which the African Church followed. He tells us that the Churches throughout all the world followed this same Rule of Truth,[18] and Tertullian in Africa tells us the same thing. He distinguishes it from "the preaching of the Apostles, and the teaching of the Lord," as "that which is put into our mouths by the Apostles."[19] He testifies that Polycarp "received from the Apostles that one and only truth, which hath been handed on by the Church," and that this "Tradition which" the Apostles "delivered to those whom they entrusted with the Churches" is the "Rule" to which "consent many nations of the barbarians," who receive it "without letters," and who, "if one should tell them of the inventions of the heretics," would "by that old Tradition Apostolic . . . admit not even to a passing glance of the mind any of their monstrous sayings."[20] Lastly, he appeals to the "Tradition" of the Roman Church, "which it hath from the Apostles," "which Tradition proclaims One God Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth."[21]

If this Rule of Truth, the same in all the Churches, was bestowed by Baptism, what becomes of Harnack's assumption

[17] *Ib.*

[18] *Adv. Haer.*, bk. 1, c. 10.

[19] *Ib.*, bk. 2, c. 35.

[20] *Ib.*, bk. 3, c. 4.

[21] *Ib.*, c. 3.

that there was no "established baptismal confession of faith" in the East during the second and third centuries? Irenæus himself lived in the East, came from the East, and ought to know better. As for the word "canon," if it does not mean an "established" rule, one would like to know what it does mean. Again, if the "Rule" of Irenæus was an "Old Tradition Apostolic," could it have been also drawn up by himself? Finally, if this Rule existed in Rome, too, and in Africa, what else could it be but the Symbol of the Roman Church and Tertullian's Rule of Faith?

But let us leave Gaul and cross into Africa. Harnack tells us that he has "traced the old Roman symbol to the time of Tertullian."[22] Well, we shall help him to trace it a good bit farther. And Tertullian is the very man who will enable us to do so. Where did Tertullian get his Rule of Faith? That sturdy champion of Christianity does not leave us one instant in doubt as to where he got it. He got it from the Church, the Church got it from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God.[23] At any rate this is what he tells us; and we seem to catch a hint of what is passing in his mind from those words in Matthew where our Lord tells His Apostles that "all power is given" Him "in heaven and on earth," and where, in virtue of that power, He bids them go forth to teach and baptize all nations. We understand Tertullian to mean that the Apostles got the Rule of Faith from Christ, in the same sense that they got from Christ the Faith itself and the authority to formulate such points of it as they deemed needful to grave "on the fleshly tablets" of the hearts of those who were first to "believe" before they could be "baptized." If one thing more than another is clear from the writings of Tertullian, it is that there did not dwell in his mind the shadow of a shade of doubt that the Apostles themselves drew up the Rule of Faith. He regards it as "incredible" that they should not "have set forth to all every clause of the Rule in order (omnem ordinem regulae)."[24] He points out how impossible it would be for "so many and so great Churches to stray into the one Faith," and that what is "one among many comes not by hap, but by

[22] *Op. cit.* p. 70.

[23] *De Praescript.*, c. 37 (Migne, tom. 2, col. 50).

[24] *Ib.*, c. 27.

tradition."[25] He declares that "this Rule existed from the beginning of the Gospel, even before the earliest heresies."[26]

But Harnack's own words shall serve to show how Tertullian witnesses to the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol. He tells us (p. 70) that it "is this [the Roman] symbol he [Tertullian] means when he writes *de praescr. haer.* 36;" and cites in part the following passage:

"But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church how happy, into which the Apostles poured all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter has a like passion with the Lord; where Paul is crowned with an end like the Baptist's; where the Apostle John, after he is plunged into boiling oil, and has suffered nothing, is banished to an island. Let us see what she learned, what she taught, when she gave the Symbol also to the Churches of Africa. She confesses one God, the Creator of the universe, and Christ Jesus, the Son of God the Creator, born of the Virgin Mary, and the resurrection of the flesh."

It is of these last words that Harnack says: "This is the symbol that he means." Just so. But Tertullian testifies that the Church of Rome got this Symbol from the Apostles, and gave it to the Churches of Africa, *i. e.*, of proconsular Africa and the parts adjacent. This is "what she learned"[27] from Peter and Paul, her first teachers in the Faith, and this is "what she taught, when she admitted the Africans also into fellowship in that Faith by delivering to them its Symbol."[28] Tertullian answers his own question, and he answers it by citing the "tessera" or Symbol of the Faith. The words of the text are, "cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit." This "contesserarit," a word coined by Tertullian himself, wherein to hide his Symbol, seems to have puzzled editors and translators alike. Some of the editors have changed it into "contestatur," which is never found with a dative, which as a present tense would not follow an aorist, and which gives no meaning; others into "contesseratur," which is from the same verb, but not in the proper mood nor tense. The translator

[25] *Ib.*, c. 28.

[26] *Adv. Prax.*, c. 2.

[27] It is not "quae" but "quid," not "what things" but "what thing."

[28] Nothing short of a paraphrase can bring out the full meaning of "*contesserarit.*"

of this passage, in *The Faith of Catholics*, renders it: "Let us see what she hath learned, what taught, what fellowship she hath had with the churches of Africa likewise." But "didicerit" and "docuerit" are aorists, not present perfect tenses, for it was from the Apostles the Roman Church "learned" that Faith which she afterwards "taught" the Churches of Africa. And "cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis contesserarit" does not yield the meaning "what fellowship, etc.," but rather "when she gave the symbol of fellowship in Christ to the African Churches.[29] Her Apostolic Symbol was the incorrupt germ whence the virgin Mother Church of Rome begot her virgin daughters in Africa also. And, to vary the metaphor, with the varying use of the Symbol, this was the signet ring she placed upon their fingers on the day she clothed them in the white robes of their Baptism—the seal and sure token of their birthright in God, their espousals in Christ, and their fellowship in the one Faith. The word "tessera," from which Tertullian boldly coined the verb "contesserare" (not the first nor yet the last sample of his work in this line), means "symbol," and we all know, or ought to know, that the symbol of fellowship among the early Christians was no other than the Apostolic Symbol. A few chapters back, in the same work, Tertullian uses the expression "contesseratio hospitalitatis" to signify how the Symbol of their common Faith served the early Christians as a token whereby they could recognize and, recognizing, give the right hand of fellowship and hospitality to their pilgrim brethren. The

[29] It would seem that the translator based his rendering on the reading of this passage given by Burn at page 49 of his work. "Videamus, quid didicerit, quid docuerit, quid cum Africanis quoque ecclesiis *contesserauit.*" This I take to be another attempt at mending a text, which stood in need of interpretation, not mending. Of course there should be no comma after "Videamus;" "quid" is the interrogative, and introduces a dependent question. Obviously, then, "contesseravit" is a mistake. There is a parallelism of construction in the "quid" clauses, and one needs not to have studied the classics at Eton or Oxford to know that a dependent question never has its verb in the indicative. But perhaps "contesseravit" is a misprint. The "cum" of this reading is a preposition; the "cum" of Migne's text, a conjunctive adverb; but between the two readings there is no essential difference of meaning. Whether "Africanis ecclesiis," in Migne's, is a dative or an ablative we can only conjecture. The privilege of coining a new verb must carry with it the privilege of saying what case it shall govern—*saeviant quantumvis grammatici.* (The word *contesserauit* given above is so printed in Burn's book. The *u* of the last syllable is old Latin spelling for *v*.)

Symbol was their test of Church membership, by means of which, as the Anglican Blunt well expresses it in the work already cited, "in the first troubled years of the Church, Christians proceeding from one point of the world to another were at once known and received into unreserved communion as brethren in one common Lord."

Readers of the Breviary will remember that in the Office of St. Cecilia we are told how the Saint sent Vespasian for baptism to Pope Urban, and how "signo quod acceperat invenit sanctum Urbanum." What was this "sign" if not the Baptismal Symbol? We may conjecture, also, that when our Blessed Lord likens the Kingdom of Heaven to a woman who takes a little leaven and hides it in three measures of meal, till the whole mass is leavened (Matt. 13: 33; Luke 13: 21), He has the Symbol in His mind's eye. The woman is the Church, and the leaven is the Symbol which she takes and hides away for a space in the multitude of all nations and tribes and tongues, till the whole mass is leavened—till the power of paganism is broken, and the peoples of the earth gather, in the open day, around the standard of the Cross. The Gospel was to be preached from the housetops from the very first. But the Symbol, which was not given openly to men, nor "written with ink on paper, but graved on the fleshly tablets of the heart," was, like the leaven in the meal, secretly doing its work in all the world.[30]

We have next to see what answer can be made to those who say that the tradition of the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol was not only unknown in the East, but that even in the West, St. Augustine, so far from adhering to it, says expressly that the very words which compose the Symbol were taken from the Scripture.

ALEXANDER MACDONALD, D.D.

St. Francis Xavier College,
Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

[30] So far as I have been able to see, the only one of the Fathers who notes and lays stress on the use of "hid" in the parable of the leaven is St. Clement of Alexandria, who lived at a time and in a place where the Discipline of the Secret seems to have been observed with more than ordinary strictness. "Now even also by means of the parable of the leaven," he observes, "does our Lord signify the concealment (τὴν ἐπικρυψιν), for He says, "*The Kingdom of heaven is like to leaven, which a woman took and hid in three bushels of meal, until the whole was leavened.*" —*Strom.*, l. 5, n. 12.

REPORTS OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSIONS (OF 1899–1900) ON RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL MATTERS.

IT is likely that the historian of the Philippines and its vast sister island groups of Carolines and Marianas will look for sources of information relative to the countless problems of all kinds associated with those three archipelagos to the many works in original, or compiled form now being published by the United States Government. Nor without good reason. Of these official, therefore presumably trustworthy, documents not a few, as is readily acknowledged, are of great aid to scholars, replete as they are with varied data not otherwise easily attainable. Especially helpful are such works as bear on the present material conditions of human life in those islands, on industries, finance, trade, commerce, food supplies, as well as the very many varieties of racial and linguistic character, in the inhabitants thereof, not excluding either the numerous and sometimes very striking singularities in type of the numberless realms of fauna and flora encountered by explorers in that far-away quarter of our eastern domain.

Nor among our Washington treasures should the scholar overlook the many treatises descriptive of the meteorology and topography of those archipelagos, the latter in the form of surveys, charts and atlases, several by European pen and pencil, that have been given to scholardom by American experts.

Admirable treatises of high scientific worth are in the reports, too, of the Philippine Commissioners of 1899 and 1900 (under Dr. Schurman and Judge Taft), in which all we need say here is that (in their four volumes) they present much useful and interesting data in the form of "exhibits," tables, and papers relative to various provinces and pueblos in those islands, along with statistics bearing on ethnology, temperature, physical geography and the like.

But for its worthiness from a scientific standpoint on neat and pretty complete scale, though somewhat unhandy for its bulk, yet none the less authoritative therefore, is a book to be welcomed by statisticians, the voluminous *Pronouncing Gazetteer and Geographic Dictionary of the Philippines* [Washington, 1902], by far and away perhaps as good a representative of its class as is to be had in our American scholastic world.

For therein, besides the usual features of its kind, are much valuable data relating to temperature, the various censuses of the islands, from the earliest in 1735 down, lists of the eighty-four tribal names, and chief dialects in use, catalogues of plants, woods, fruits, minerals, mammals, fishes and birds, then a chronologic table of the principal events in the islands from A. D. 1519 to 1901, with a list of the Governors-general to Diego de los Rios, the last in 1898.[1]

Referring to this *Gazetteer* the writer has observed that the latitude of Manila, given officially (p. 183) as " 14° 35′ 31″ N.," is identically the same as set down in the *Atlas de Filipinas* of Jesuit scientists at Manila, also published by Government [Washington, 1899], a location of that metropolis (be it recalled) that varies only twenty-nine seconds from the latitude determined for it by the Friar geographer of the Augustinians, Villacorta, who published his statistics nearly three-quarters of a century ago.[2]

Yet among these noteworthy honorable works of artistic, scientific and historical tone are several others, which, though fair-looking and scholarly enough, will be found replete with defects of many kinds, against equity, good taste, and ethics, despite their very imposing sponsorship by men, too, of mark in the realms of letters and statecraft.[3]

Such are the reports on Philippine affairs by the two Commissions headed respectively by Dr. Schurman and Judge Taft. They were drawn up in the closing years of the century just closed. Among other subjects treated therein are various pictures of religious, educational and social life in those islands—of churchmen, missionary labors, school-teachers, institutes of industry, orphanages, asylums and the like. They are entitled:

Report of the Philippine Commission [Washington, 1900], in two vols. of 774 pages. (In the second volume is the testimony taken by the Schurman Commission.)

[1] The index to this admirable volume, however, is in a very out-of-the-way place, where one would barely look for it, about the middle of the book itself. (See p. 249.)

[2] A paper on these two atlases (by the present writer) was published in *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* last year. (See xiii, 4–21.)

[3] Among the members of the two Philippine Commissions were litterati, lawyers, judges, writers. We name them later.

Reports of the Taft Philippine Commission [Washington, 1901], one volume of 333 pages.

Senate Document, No. 190 [S. l. s. a., but Washington, 1901], one volume of 283 pages. (This contains the testimony taken by the Taft Commission.)[4]

General Observations.

In our observations on these Philippine reports we shall be guided by the following limitations:

1. In our strictures thereon no reflection is meant on the personal character of the nine members of the Commissions, nor on all like. Some of them, perhaps, were fair minded men. Anyhow there is no evidence to the contrary. But, *per contra*, others were positively unfair, as is proved too by their papers on Philippine matters published prior to their appointment as Commissioners. Therein they have set themselves on record as strongly prejudiced against the very defendants they were pledged to try with judicial fairness.

2. Nor are our remarks to be taken as bearing against anything else in their reports than the Commissioners' treatment of such subjects as the Christian religion, Christian churches, Christian education and the Christian life of the natives, with their standards of Christian civilization.

3. We observe also that throughout this paper we style as "defendants" that numerous body of philanthropists in the Philippines and its associated groups,—churchmen, prelates, missionaries, friars, teachers, school officers and others, all dedicated to religion in one way or another, who in these reports have been denounced as guilty of divers crimes,—of un-Christian, nay even unnatural, conduct.

The defendants have been charged with simony, cruelty, rapacity, sensuousness, or, more briefly, with having used their sacred office and title mainly for mere self-gratification—charges given by the Commissioners in detail, in terms however that our pages refuse to reproduce in their original foulness.

As "prosecutors" therefore we name the Commissioners as a

[4] For the sake of brevity these works are referred to respectively as *Schurman*, *Taft*, and *Sen. Doc.*

body, who at the same time filled the part of judges, investigators and attorneys for the prosecution.

Church Statistics in 1898.

To our task, then. But a glance, first,—a kind of bird's-eye view, as it were, of the main agencies lately at work in the civilization and enlightenment of the natives of those islands, where ever since the days of the Christian pioneers of the sixteenth century, their successors (as noticed by chroniclers and travellers, even non-Catholic) have kept to the task as staunch upholders of civilization on Christian lines, of morality, order, law, in that vast region of Malaysia, of countless islands large and small.

In 1898, the year of the downfall of Spanish rule in the three great archipelagos of Philippines, Marianas, and Carolines, there were in service throughout the islands 1642 priests, churchmen of divers ranks, five of them bishops, one the Archbishop of Manila; then clergy of lower degree,—vicars-general, *parrocos*, missionaries, nearly all members of religious orders.

According to Dr. Schurman (whose figures we reproduce here), the clergy of the Philippines numbered about 2383. They were communicated to him (he says) by the Church authorities at Manila; and the figures are no doubt right. But in some cases, at least, they represent the totality of membership in the several orders of churchmen, not only in actual service in the islands, but the members of the various brotherhoods—clerics and laics also at work abroad in houses and colleges of their order in Europe, Asia, and America. Hence the figures given by the Doctor are misleading. Thus, for instance, in his statistics for the Augustinians, who numbered (he says) 644, are included 203 students in Spain, in course of education at colleges of their order at Valladolid and La Vid, in preparation for active mission service in eastern lands, in care of their province, as the Philippines and China. But, as said above, the number of priests in the islands in 1898 was only 1642. Here are the Doctor's figures [i, 133-136]: Augustinians, 644; Benedictines, 14; Capuchins, 36; Dominicans, 528; Franciscans, 475; Jesuits, 164; Lazarists,[5] 35,

[5] Lazarists as commonly known in the U. S. appear in Spanish statistics variously as *Paulos*, *Paulistas*, *de San Vicente de Paulo*. Officially Lazarists are known as members of the *Congregatio Missionum*, whence the letters "C. M." after their names.

of whom 27 only were priests; Recoletos, or discalced, unshod Augustinians, 522. While of native clergymen—"indigenas," there were (according to Judge Taft) [p. 24][6] 150, "in charge of small parishes." All, however, employed, as were their white brothers, in various branches of philanthropic, religious, and educational work.

In the Philippines, it may be stated, were 967 districts with care of souls,—parishes, 746; mission parishes, 105; then *misiones activas* (where heathens were to be converted, as in Mindanao and some parts of Luzon), 116. In all, the Catholic population of the islands for 1897-1898 was 6,559,998 souls.[7]

Here are some census figures regarding church statistics of various denominations in the United States that perhaps may be of interest. They were drawn up by the Rev. Dr. Carroll, non-Catholic, and are as follows:

	Ministers.	Churches.	Communicants.
Methodist (17 bodies)	39,220	56,787	6,084,755
Baptists (13 bodies)	35,564	51,142	4,629,487
Presbyterians (12 bodies)	12,207	15,315	1,635,016

or, on an average, one minister for every 155 Methodists; one for every 130 Baptists; one for every 133 Presbyterians. [From *Literary Digest*, N. Y., for January 31, 1903, p. 158.]

In 1898, in our Malaysian groups of archipelagos with a Catholic population (as said) of 6,559,998 souls, in charge of 1642 missionaries, we thus have on similar average, one Catholic priest for every 3995 natives,—a fact that goes to show very conclusively that Catholic friars by no means were overrunning the Philippines. No, those islands were most assuredly not a "priest-ridden land." The various orders of churchmen (named above), it may be observed, entered missionary service in the Philippines in the following years: Augustinians, in 1565; Franciscans, in 1577; Dominicans and Jesuits, in 1581 (the latter driven from the

[6] From other sources, however, we learn that the number of native priests in the Philippines was 675; while the total regular clergy was only 967, or in all 1642.

[7] The above parish figures and population census are from Judge Taft's Report [p. 23] and they, too, are right.

islands in 1768, returned in 1859); Recoletos, in 1606; Capuchins, in 1886, and Benedictines in 1895.[8]

Besides there was another class of civilizing agencies in those islands, all doing steady and healthful service, bodies by no means to be omitted from our rolls of honor—the various sisterhoods of (women) religious in those archipelagos, as Assumptionists (miswritten "Ascensionists" by Dr. Schurman) [ii, 458], or sisters *de la Asuncion*, under the rule of St. Augustine; Dominicanesses; Franciscans, in number thirty-four—all tertiaries or members of third orders; then Sisters of Charity—gentlewomen trained in the service of God and their neighbor as teachers, guardians of maidenhood, nurses—all devoted to various works of beneficence in school-room, hospital, asylum, *beaterio*, while similarly all were adepts of greater or less skill in the practice of homelike virtues, preëminently peculiar of the feminine world in every Christian commonwealth—contemplation and prayer, otherwise the love of learning on lofty lines with the love of God—religion—basis of true exalted patriotism. (At this writing the number of these self-sacrificing women-philanthropists in those tropical regions is not known, with the two exceptions above.[9])

Renowned among the islanders were the four great *beaterios*—homes, retreat-houses, as well as boarding-schools, for needy maidens, thence styled *beatas*. They were the following: *de la Compañia de Jesus*, or San Ignacio, founded in 1684, by Ignacia de Espiritu Santo, a pious mestiza of Binondo; St. Catharine of Siena, founded by Dominicans under their provincial, Juan de San Domingo, in 1696, both of Manila origin; San Sebastian of Calumpang, founded in 1719 by four Indian maidens, though seventeen years later, in 1736, put under the direction of Recoletas; then Santa Rita of Cascia, founded at Pasig, in 1740, by the earnest-souled and very energetic *parroco* of that pueblo, Felix de Trillo, Augustinian, under the title of *la Concepcion*.

Then there were orphan asylums. Thus, at Mandaloya, a few

[8] Information as to the date of entrance of the Lazarists is not at hand. According to Dr. Schurman, the Lazarists arrived in 1862. [*Schurman*, i, 135.]

[9] But since these pages were put in print, we learn that the Sisters of Charity in the islands numbered 184, of whom 147 were Spanish, 22 mestizas, 14 Filipinas, and one Portuguese.

miles distant from Manila, where the Augustinians had an asylum for girls, established in 1883, were several Indian sisters—natives—who, with their Spanish sisters of the Asuncion, cared for 122 orphan girls, whom they housed, fed, clothed, and taught. During the late invasion of the islands, these Indian maidens, driven with the others from their home, fled to Manila for shelter. At Mandaloya, the little girls were taught needle-work, embroidery, laundry, ironing, and such other industries as would enable them to gain an honest livelihood.

While at Tambóbong, not far from Manila, was a similar establishment for boys, that previously had been conducted at Malabón, still earlier at Guadalupe, a pueblo in care of Augustinians, where, in 1882, under the title of Our Lady of Consolation, and St. Thomas of Villanova, the Fathers established the first orphanage in Luzon, transferred thither from Mandaloya, now given over to girls. At Tambóbong asylum, 145 little lads (without father or mother) were trained as printers, bookbinders, tailors. In 1898, or soon after, both asylums were destroyed, with their libraries, museums, machinery, and all.

In care then of those guardians of Christian society, of its shrines, homes of learning and industry, throughout the various islands, were many institutions that make for the higher life of mankind—establishments of religion, education, public beneficence, some of them dating from the first years of the re-discovery of the Philippines under Legazpi and his companion, the Friar cosmographer and sailor, Urdaneta, of the Augustinians.

Thus in 1897–1898, as we learn from official statistics, in the Philippines and its sister groups, were the following institutions of the higher life: university, one; colleges (number not known); seminaries for cleric training, five; orphanages, two; hospitals, ten; pueblo, or common schools, for Indians, 2140; *beaterios*, or homes for maidens, four; besides many societies or guilds of religious and beneficial character attached to the several churches in cities and pueblos, known variously as confraternities, sodalities—*hermandades*. Named in Philippine statistics we find the following: *hermandad de la Misericordia*, that as early as 1596 established the hospital of San Juan de Dios, though a still earlier asylum for the sick—San Lazaro, had been opened in 1578, by

the Franciscan lay brother Juan Clemente; then the Recoleto confraternity of Jesus Nazareno, founded in 1651; the confraternities of the Most Holy Sacrament at Manila Cathedral church in 1604, and a similar guild at Binondo in 1681; while from the first years of their entrance into Philippine fields Augustinian and Dominican had erected branch fraternities of their order in well nigh every mission-town. In 1571, Cebú witnessed the formation of the first confraternity in the islands—*Nuestra Señora de la Correa*, or Our Lady of the Girdle, by pioneer Augustinians; Manila, the second shortly after.

In his "Exhibit" [No. vi]—a valuable and very interesting display of "Public Instruction . . . during Spanish Sovereignty" in those islands, Dr. Schurman, though naming the greater number of these establishments of high rank, of religious and social eminence, still has omitted some, as will be noticed. [*Schurman*, ii, 456–476.[10]]

Charges Against the Reports.

In our analysis of these reports we purpose to show that in framing them the Commissioners, contrary to the canons of judicial as well as historic equity, were in fault also on many points of vital importance to the defendants.

1. Because of numerous omissions in the evidence accepted, however, by the Commissioners as conclusive—evidence, moreover, that bore strongly in favor of the defence, on such points as (*a*) the primal and contemporary state of civilization and refinement in the Philippines; (*b*) the present fairly high character of the natives for intellectual and moral virtuousness; (*c*) the work of the Church in uplifting the Philippines and other Malaysian island-groups to a lofty plane of domestic and social welfare, (*d*) with school facilities and good results therefrom in even far distant islands of those great archipelagos.

Again, in these reports you will find little or no mention, except maybe in some out-of-the-way place, of the innumerable

[10] In this respect the Taft report is meagre, in fact very deficient, the Judge (unless we mistake) mentioning only San José College at Manila, that had been opened in 1601, by the Jesuit visitor of their missions—Luis Gomez. [*Sen. Doc.*, 26–46.]

monuments of intellective and material art, as shrines, church-buildings, *conventos*, libraries, cabinets of physics, of natural history, many of them centuries old, with no others like them in Eastern or Asiatic lands, all in charge of scholarly and enthusiastic men and women devoted to lofty planes of thought,—all tokens of high-grade civilization, to be discerned (let it be marked very plainly) only in countries and lands of thorough Christian ideals. As a most striking, though very gloomy, contrast to this picture here with deep pity we need but a glance at the semi-barbaric islands in Malaysia not under Christian influence or sway—the Sulu, or Jolo group, then Borneo, Java, where the natives, under the fetters of Mammon, are, as it were, little else than savages, or bondsmen to grasping money-making European taskmasters and traders.

The omission in these reports of the above-named material proofs of intellective worth among the Philippines is to be emphasized very strongly. Throughout their papers (we must add), the Commissioners seem to have been lacking in appreciative, if not even friendly, spirit also; to have displayed throughout an unkindly tone with reference to all Christian concerns, while sparing (as will appear) no space for the embalmment therein of whatever could be raked together derogatory in any way to the manifold grandeur of Christian æstheticism in the East.

2. Because evidence, which was not lacking to the defence, if admitted at all, was accepted in grudging, unhandsome spirit, as it were. Thus, while in the Schurman report, as observed, some of these model art-works have been named, in his successor's only one has been mentioned. (See above.)

3. Moreover, the prosecution has admitted as final and conclusive, without the slightest substantiation—proof of any kind, whatever testimony, even of the flimsiest, could be twisted and stretched, to the discredit of the defendants.

4. In many of their allusions to Philippine life, ideals, customs, people, missionaries, institutions, and the like, Christianity, that is, the Catholic religion, if referred to at all, is with depreciating tone. Here are some samples. In touching on school matters, Dr. Schurman declares it a faulty practice, a

"mistaken idea of putting instruction in Christian doctrine before reading and writing." [*Schurman*, ii, 457.]

Judge Taft, too, finds occasion for censure, in that

"in the typical provincial school at first a kind of religious primer was read in the native language, and that later a book on Christian doctrine was taught." [*Taft*, 106.]

Indeed. So it's wrong, then, to teach young children their religion? Yet, if we mistake not, and as we stoutly believe, it is still healthy common practice in all well brought up Christian home-circles to teach a child the principles of good behavior at its mother's knee, long too before it has entered, or even dreamed of, the very entangling mysteries of A-B-C books, or pot-hooks. Why then in the Philippines should similar ethical usage be deemed out of place?

Judge Taft, moreover, fairly revels, it seems, in his fancy for flaw-picking at the slightest chance in any matters that may be interpreted to the disfavor of churchmen. Just here one instance merely. In his report, where engaged in building up a case against the defendants, in order apparently to score a point to their discomfort, he has taken their testimony to pieces, instead of giving it in full; then quotes some fragments, which apparently put the defendants in the wrong. Thus to a consideration of the testimony of the provincial of the Franciscans the Judge allots a little over a page [*Taft*, 25, 26]; to the Augustinian provincial less than two lines [*Id.*, 26, 27], and to the Bishop of Jaro less than ten [*Id.*, 29], or at most in all a very meagre two pages, though elsewhere these very defendants have been styled by the Judge as men of high rank. Though printed in a wholly different work, one may find in full the testimony of these three churchmen [*Sen. Doc.*, 63–71, for Villegas of the Franciscans; 71–80, for Lobo, of the Augustinians; 112–122, for the bishop]—a book, however, as may be noticed, of wholly different title, one moreover, that the reader of the Judge's report will not likely know anything about until maybe long after his mutilations have wrought their effect in the reader's mind. (Later we will give other samples of the Judge's expertness in word-twisting.)

Again Judge Taft is more than once in conflict with his own words. Thus, to churchmen in the Philippines he pays a rather neat eulogy by saying that

"the friar . . . was usually the only man of intelligence and education." [*Taft*, 24.]

Again that

"There were, of course, many educated gentlemen of high moral standards among the friars. The bishops and provincials who testified were all of this class." [*Id.*, 28.]

While *per contra* of the natives he declares that

". . . the masses of the people are ignorant, credulous and childlike" [*Id.*, 15], an "ignorant people." [*Id.*, 32.]

Yet all of a sudden when treating of the charges brought by these self-same "ignorant" and "credulous" prosecutors against their old-time missionaries and friends—"gentlemen (*too*) of high moral standards,"—the Judge with a rather unaccountable face-about movement would have us not believe these defendants. That is, to use his own words,

"the charges (*against churchmen*) have considerable truth in them" [*Id.*, 29]; ". . . the statements of the bishops and friars . . . cannot be accepted as accurate." [*Id.*, 30.]

In fact, in these kaleidoscope-looking reports, so commonly in them are admissions in favor of the defendants matched with denouncements of everything churchly, that, according wholly to his own proper frame of spirit, be this friendly or adverse to churchman, the reader may be warranted in drawing pretty much any kind of conclusion he is seeking,—a seeming abnormality however of unscholarly psychology, exemplified in the reports of the very Commissioners themselves, who, though arguing seemingly from self-same premises (the evidence in their reports being practically identical), yet reach conclusions diametrically opposite.

Thus, in describing the high grade of refinement among the Philippines, Dr. Schurman styles them as "civilized." [*Schurman*, 12.]

"A majority of the inhabitants . . . (*he says are*) possessed of a considerable degree of civilization." [*Id.*, 16.]

There are

"provinces . . . whose people are most highly civilized." [*Id.*, 18.]

But, according to the Judge, these very same people are "ignorant," etc. [See quotations ahead.]

Again, according to the Doctor,

"the normal school, conducted by the Jesuits, at Manila, . . . has done good work in training teachers, etc. [*Schurman*, i, 34.]

The Judge, however, with no exception, would have us believe (in his section on "Education under Spanish rule") that

"native teachers (*are*) tediously mechanical, noisy, and hardly effective, or economical." [*Taft*, 105, 106.]

That is to say, in these reports where now and then one Commissioner hails a gleam of sunshine in the intellectual firmament of the Philippines, the other at no time seems to descry aught but hopeless chaos and gloom. The Doctor styles the Philippines enlightened; the Judge, barbaric. Or, more briefly, to sum up these few vari-colored illustrations of judicial conflicts relating to the religious, ethical, and social characteristics of those islanders (of which the reader will meet several others before ending these pages), the deductions in matters, too, of very weighty moment drawn by the Commissioners (they say) from the testimony of their own witnesses, will be found in conflict with it. At the same time, too, the reader will notice that the Commissioners themselves are in open conflict with one another.

We need here make a reflection that we have long been pondering over, in view of the almost absolute unqualified condemnation (in these reports) of the whole past in the Philippines, of all systems of rule, of ethics, piety, faith, law, good works, in brief, of the grandeurs of our Christian Malaysia—glories that yet have been attested with enthusiastic praise by numberless travellers, scholars, explorers, even non-Catholic. Was there then (in 1899–1900) at Manila in and around these two courts of our Commissioners some mysterious, occult, (maybe even) mischief-making power at work to set at odds with one another all concerned in those courts of inquiry and trial—judges, witnesses, prosecutors?—to mislead them in defiance even of their own philosophic—nobler—instincts of the evidence of their own eyes and ears? And did this malign genius (as at times seems to have happened in America and Europe, why then not in Asia?) not try its hardest with the aid of cable and printing-press to blot out from the inhabitants of the Philippines all respect for their one-

time happy and prosperous sacred and civil estate, to overturn in their souls every mark of regard and love for the Christian faith, for Christian law, for Christian policy? (Of similar evil influences against our schools, altars, and homes, here, and in Europe, we have read before.) But let this go as a mere reflection.

Genesis of the Reports.

So much then for a mere bird's-eye view, as it were, of our field of instruction, and scholastic entertainment in these four volumes of Manila reports,—a general perspective of the work done in those high assemblies in the Philippines.

Now for our analysis of these reports in detail. And first as to the genesis of the courts themselves, that in their legislative and judicial pomp and grandeur, in their sittings at Manila in the closing years of the century just passed, gave Malaysia a forecast of the new rule and the new order of things.

The first Commission (under Dr. Schurman) (it may be premised) began its hearings in the early summer of 1899, less than a year after the downfall of Spain in the East. [*Schurman*, i, 1.]

At this time, we may observe, outside of Spain knowledge of the Philippines was meagre enough. As shown in our encyclopedias, histories, and atlases, those islands were practically a *terra incognita* of common reputation only for hemp and cigars.

Members of this Commission were: Jacob Gould Schurman, LL.D.; Major General Elwell S. Otis, of the U. S. Army; Rear Admiral George Dewey, of the U. S. Navy; Charles Denby, LL.D., lawyer, diplomat, formerly Minister to China; Dean Conant Worcester, professor of zoology and botany; while John R. McArthur was appointed Secretary and Counsel of the Commission, and Rutherford Corbin, Assistant Secretary. [*Schurman*, i, 1.]

This Commission was charged to investigate the conditions of life in those Asiatic archipelagos, to suggest solutions of problems bearing on "order, peace and public welfare," while it was instructed, moreover, to observe due regard for "all ideals, customs and institutions" of the inhabitants,[11]—all problems, it may be

[11] "Tribes," however, is the word used by President McKinley in his letter of instructions to the first Commission, for which see *Schurman*, i, 186.

added, that so far in the history of philosophic and political speculations have taxed gravely the wisdom of even the sagest geniuses among men.

It is matter for deep reflection that our own non-white fellow inhabitants in the United States—blacks, mulattos, Indians, as well as people of other colors, are not yet on the same social, if not also political, standing with whites.

The second Commission (under Judge Taft) opened its sessions

"in July (1900) and continued from time to time until late in October"

of the same year, having begun

"its legislative and executive duties under the instructions of the President"

on the first of September previous. [*Taft*, 16, 19.] Members of this commission were William H. Taft, Dean C.Worcester, Luke E. Wright, Henry C. Ide, Bernard Moses, Ph.D., professor of history and political economy. [*Taft*, 15.] As to the other officers of this Commission, and the reasons for the dissolution of its predecessor, positive information is lacking. It would appear, however, that the Schurman Commission, whose report in a way is rather favorable to the defendants, was withal somewhat too manly, of too independent frame, to suit the schemes of interested parties in the political and commercial world in the United States, especially that had an eye mainly on the mere material possibilities in the Philippines. (The race of "boomers" of various kinds was not yet extinct.) So much, then, for the personnel of the two Commissions.

Mode of Procedure in the Commissions.

Now for a panorama of their acts, during the years 1899–1900. From details gleaned here and there in their reports as to the mode of procedure employed in assembly—a very important feature for the student in order to discern the significance of their moves in this stupendous drama of politics—we learn that

"in preparing their several papers the members of the Commission (the first) . . . derived data not only from Spanish books and

documents, . . . but also from evidence taken from witnesses," . . . [*Schurman*, ii, vii.]

These witnesses, as we learn elsewhere in the Doctor's report, were 46, their names appearing in the index at the end of the second volume [ii, 477–486]; and among them, as far as we can make out, were only three churchmen, of whom more later on.

The names of the witnesses before the second Commission (under Judge Taft) number 38, to be found with their testimony *in extenso* in *Sen. Doc.*, 47–283. Eleven of them were churchmen, two of whom had already testified before Dr. Schurman. Thus, of the 84 witnesses before the two Commissions, twelve only were for the defence, in fact were defendants themselves.

The reader is not to overlook this plain matter of fact, that the clergy in the Philippines and its sister archipelagos, hundreds and hundreds in number, were in control, not only of many institutions of learning, art-work, science; of colleges, seminaries, pueblo schools, established throughout those islands, but besides were entrusted as so many bulwarks of order, peace, and law, with certain government functions in nearly all the provinces, especially where Indians were the sole population. Here in a general way the missionaries were the instructors, guides, caretakers of the Philippine commonwealth in spiritual and temporal concerns. For these duties the friars had received especial training in their colleges in Europe. They were expert in the management of Indians. While also, it may be noted, such blending of the two fields of Church and civil authority and power in the Philippines in one and the same individual, who, at the same time, was the minister of religion, as well as the main person of prominence or standing among the natives themselves, is frequently described in these reports [*Taft*, 25, 26], though never in commendatory terms. In our Government schools for Indians "out West," similar union of Church and State in the person of one and the same incumbent, whether mere trader, politician, money-maker, or even minister of God, has been exemplified often. (But this, however fruitful in reflections, is a digression.) As to the Doctor's valuation of topics of such magnitude, we return to his reports. There we find a paper of but 7½ pages in length at the furthest, devoted to clergy [*Schurman*, i, 130–

136]; to education, another paper of 25 pages [*Id.*, i, 17–42]; and a third, on "Public Instruction in the Philippines during the time of Spanish Sovereignty," otherwise "Exhibit VI," of 20 pages [*Id.*, ii, 456–476]. That is, of the 775 pages of his reports, only 52½, not as much as 7 per cent., have been devoted to the main civilizing agencies at work in the Philippines in their various fields of peace, wherein the prosperity and happiness of about 7,000,000 souls were concerned—a somewhat meagre allowance of literature (it may be remarked) on the main subject of all—a species of literary vacuity that would indicate, it seems, somewhat of a lack of proportion with the balance of the Doctor's report.

But to continue with our Schurman sessions, wherein we are told that

> "the witnesses came in freely, . . . from all classes of the people, and they represented all varieties of opinion." [*Schurman*, ii, vii.]

A picturesque description, this, of admirable fairness in appearance—a bit of rhetorical fancy, however, of "putting the thing which is not for the thing which is," that (as far as the reports themselves go) is without but a very faint scintilla of truth.

At the very most, of Dr. Schurman's 46 witnesses, three churchmen only appeared, merely however as teachers; they were questioned by the Commission merely on educational subjects. They were the Dominican rector of the University of Manila, Father Santiago Paya, and two Jesuits, Fathers Miguel Saderra, of the Ateneo, and Pedro Torra, of the Normal School [*Schurman*, ii, 242, 278]. While, so far as we can judge, all the other witnesses, 43 in number, were for the prosecution, nearly all out of sympathy for the defendants, where they were not professedly in open antagonism to them.

The "varieties of opinion" besides that the Doctor refers to, seem from the reports to have been little else than a mass of unclean, harsh and loathsome details regarding Church affairs, and very "Maria-Monkish" in looks,—anti-Catholic, anti-Christian. In this respect about the only difference between the reports of the two Commissioners is that while Dr. Schurman publishes, of course, all his anti-friar testimony (without comment, however), the Judge all through seems to believe it; nay, even goes out of

his way to support it with the prestige of his judicial mantle. Thus, after traversing some very foul charges against Philippine churchmen, he thinks to account for their frailty by saying they came to the islands

"from the peasant class in Andalusia—" [*Taft*, 28.]

an allusion, by the way, to this one-time old Mahometan stronghold in Spain, that, like other neat-looking fancies of rhetoric in these reports, happens to have little or no foundation in fact. After some considerable research into the birthplaces of our Philippine missionaries, we are able to affirm that of all the Spanish ecclesiastics serving in those islands for years and years past, it happens that there was one friar only—a Dominican Father, that hailed from Andalusia,—the one solitary specimen of that much reviled "peasant class." By the way, is it not a historical record that the ancestry of most of us Caucasians (the Judge, too, included) is traceable to the farming, or "peasant class," of the olden times? With some display of fair-mindedness Judge Taft, however, appears to deprecate the general anti-friar tone of his native witnesses. Again and again he records his opinion that neither religion nor morality was a factor to be considered in the Philippine question. Thus emphatically he declares it

"was not a religious question." [*Taft*, 30.]

Again, that

"the feeling against the friars is solely political." [*Ib.*]

And still again, that

"immorality (*of the friars*) was not the chief ground for hostility—" [*Ib.*, 29.]

while, moreover,

"their immorality as such (*he adds*) would not have made them hateful to the people . . . the people do not feel any ill will against (*the Filipino priests*) on this account." [*Ib.*]

And so on and so on; all which is very true, as according to the verdict of scholars (reiterated, moreover, by the Judge) no question of ethics is usually entertained by Katipuneros, or people of that stamp. And would it be out of place to inquire why, even if

true, the Judge then allowed all that "irrelevant" testimony to be published *in extenso*—in detail? Or, in view of the grave disedification resulting therefrom, if the charges against the defendants were false, why, in the interests of public decency, should he not have tried the friar case *in camera?*—a usage not uncommon in our courts where public welfare is in peril. Or, if ethics fails to account for this legal phenomenon at Manila of suppressing all testimony in favor of the defendants, while raking together everything, no matter how "irrelevant," to their discredit, may not mere politics be considered as the dominant factor therein?

But to return to our genesis of the Schurman reports. As to the nationality of his witnesses, who, according to the Doctor, "came in freely from all classes," etc., they were (he says) of various European and Asiatic races,—

"American, Austrian, Belgian, Chinese, English, French, German and Spanish." [*Schurman* i, 2.]

in appearance a rather imposing array of witnesses. But hardly to be borne out by the official tally. Of the names of the 46 witnesses, 28 clearly are Spanish, Philippine, or Chinese orthography, thus leaving just 18 as representatives of the six other countries in Caucasia. [See the index in *Schurman*, ii, 477-486.] Again, we may remark that while in any case involving local matters, institutions, etc., the testimony of residents, especially if of long standing, is, as a rule, perfectly admissible, strangers or new-comers are rigidly held as "incompetents." In these reports then we protest against the admission as evidence of the testimony or opinions of United States civilians or army or navy officers—all practically unfamiliar except from hearsay with matters and things transpiring in a very new country discovered, we may add, only a few months before. The first Commission, be it recalled, began its hearings in the summer of 1899. (At Manila, however, we are witnessing the subversion of other things besides Spanish.)

Then the Doctor goes on to describe the business, profession, etc., of the several witnesses, who (he says) were

"brokers, bankers, merchants, lawyers, physicians, railroad men, ship owners, educators, public officers." [*Schurman*, i, 2.]

—another captivating list of "men of all classes." But let us sift it in so far as Caucasians are concerned, reserving our remarks on native witnesses—Indians, mestizos, and the like, for future comment.

According to the minutes of the Court, of the Caucasian witnesses all but three (the teachers named ahead) were laymen, and as their evidence shows almost to a man anti-defendant, though some few, we admit, were non-committal. Now at Manila, is it likely any more than elsewhere, that mere civilians—men of affairs, however keen observers they may have been in matters relating to their own lines of business, or of occurrences happening before their own eyes,—is it likely that with topics relating to the higher life—with problems in religion, philanthropy, ethics, pedagogy, mission and church society work—all problems for experts—is it likely they could be any more conversant than our own fellow lay citizens at home?

Apparently only the three "educators" we have named elsewhere represented the Church side of the Philippine question, and they were examined merely (as said) on matters associated with their profession. In alleging then that his witnesses represented "all classes of the people," "all varieties of opinion," that, in brief, they were experts in the various fields of "political, civil and religious liberty," the Doctor would have us believe the thing which is not. As a matter of fact, though the churchmen in priestly orders in the islands numbered 1642, "many of them besides educated gentlemen of high moral standards," and usually "the only men of intelligence and education,"—all persons of worth and prominence therefore; though, moreover, there were hundreds and hundreds of officers—superintendents, teachers, connected with university, colleges, seminaries, pueblo schools and *beaterios*,—all experts in their respective fields of instruction, discipline, management; though besides there were many hospitals, asylums, orphanages, homes,—all centres one way or another of high-class Christian energy, in intellective, ethical and religious spheres, yet with the exception of the three "educators" named, no others were heard by Dr. Schurman; not a prelate, nor school teacher, nor superintendent, nor officer of those numerous institutions of education, beneficence and charity at Manila

and elsewhere in the islands, appeared even in person or by proxy.[12]

And with such *lacunae* in the testimony we are expected to take these reports as full and authentic pictures of Philippine society, life and manners! What, then, did Dr. Schurman mean in alleging that his witnesses represented "all classes," "all opinions"?

In plain English, however, is this not "putting the thing which is for the thing which is not"?—an unfairness so obvious as prior to the assembly of the second Commission to call for strong protest on the part of the Church authorities at Manila. Thus we learn from Judge Taft's report, that the Apostolic Delegate, Mgr. Chapelle

> "requested that in any investigation into the matter of the friars, . . . the provincials of the orders, and the five bishops, including the archbishop of Manila, who were all of them friars, should be given a hearing." [*Taft*, 24.]

So defendants in a case of supreme interest had to solicit as favor what the law gives as right!

Moreover, of the 422 pages of testimony in the Schurman reports, consisting mainly of denunciations of friardom, only 19 in all are allotted to the evidence of the three defendants, who were questioned solely on matters relating to pedagogy.

Considerable mystery, by the way, seems to veil the compilation of these reports. Judge Taft, in describing the mode of procedure followed by his fellow commissioners, states that

> "much formal evidence was taken and transcribed, but more was gathered from informal conversation when no stenographer was present." [*Taft*, 15.]

An admission that seems to mean a great deal more than it looks. So this is the way law was interpreted at Manila, and problems of the highest interest determined "from informal conversation," gathered, too, when "no stenographer was present!"

But there are conundrums, not a few, that meet us in our

[12] Should any of these various experts have been summoned, or invited to appear before the Schurman Commission, we have no information; his reports being utterly silent thereon.

study of these and similar vagaries of judicialism at Manila—the court proceedings of A. D. 1899–1900—gleams of such steady and unrelieved one-sidedness throughout, that we cannot but return to the belief grounded on our analysis of these legal forms, that by some skilful pre-arrangement (formerly known as "hocus-pocus"—a very ancient legal technicality), the reports of the Commissioners were to be "drawn up, of course according to the evidence," unless it might seem advisable (such things do at times happen)—to have the evidence somehow or other correspond with the reports. Such idiosyncrasies, we have heard, are among the mysteries and intricacies of modern law.

The witnesses that appeared before Judge Taft numbered, as said, twelve. But from a study of his reports we find that some 200 or 300 others—all natives, it seems, of Luzon, and strong for the prosecution, appeared before his Commission by deposition. Thus there is a paper signed by 97 "headmen and leading residents" of Aringay in Union province [*Sen. Doc.*, 198], another presented by "Clemente Mapuraya and 72 others," the "*presidente*, counsellors and inhabitants" of Pamplona in Cagayan province [*Id.*, 220], a third from "Sofio Alemdt and others . . . leading men and residents" of Tayabas [*Id.*, 224], and a fourth with 84 signatures from Nueva Cáceres [*Id.*, 225].[13]

A word merely about these "headmen and leading residents" of Luzon, all Indians, or mestizos. From their depositions, it appears (as already said) that through and through they were to a man all strong anti-defendants, in every way, even if not, as may be deduced from their language, anti-Christian also, just the kind of people too, I suppose, that Judge Taft has so frequently characterized as "ignorant," "credulous," "uneducated," etc. However, as witnesses against the defendants they seemed to have been rated among the "competent," as on their evidence, in part, the Judge has based his report, though it is hard to understand why elsewhere he should seek to discredit his own tools.[14]

[13] The *cabeça de barangay* = headman, was a petty Indian chieftain, head of a settlement, or pueblo, of about one hundred families. The "leading residents," very likely, were his subjects.

[14] There is no entry to show the domicile of Mapuraya, and associates, likely Luzonians, however, as were the others.

We go back again to our Caucasian witnesses for the defence,—defendants themselves, fourteen in all, counting the two pedagogical experts (as said) who appeared before the two Commissions twice.

Before Judge Taft appeared the following eleven defendants: Santiago Paya, provincial of the Dominicans; [15] Juan Villegas, provincial of the Franciscans; José Lobo, provincial of the Augustinians; Francisco Araya, provincial of the Recoletos; Alphonso Maria de Morertin, superior of the Capuchins; Juan Sabater, superior of the Benedictines; Miguel Saderra y Mata, vicar superior of the Jesuits; superior of the Lazarists (name not recorded); Bernardino Nozaleda y Villa, O.S.D., Archbishop of Manila; Andrés Ferrero, Recoleto Bishop of Santa Isabel of Jaro; the Bishop of Vigan (name not recorded). The evidence given by these church representatives is in *Sen. Doc.* [47–133].

That they were persons of considerable importance in ecclesiastical and civil fields we have these admissions of Judge Taft, who, besides styling them "educated gentlemen of high moral standards," states that

"the priest was not only the spiritual guide (*of the Philippines*), but that he was in every sense the municipal ruler." [*Taft*, 26.]
"The truth is (*he goes on to say*) that the whole government of Spain in these islands rested on the friars." [*Id.*]

Eulogy enough, we may add, but not wholly warranted by either facts or history. The Judge, in attributing Mikado-like prerogatives and powers to Philippine churchmen, runs counter to historical records of the last one hundred years or so.

Chronicles of those islands, state-papers of Governors-general, etc., refer continually to conflicts of power between the missionaries and the bureaucrats of Manila and Madrid,—the latter a hungry horde of civilians in alliance with Free Masons, *Liberales*, then Liga members and Katipuneros. The one doing their best to shield the natives from pillage, extortion, tyranny on the part of native alcaldes and Spanish officialdom,—the bane at times of our own Indian missions; the others just as intent in filling their pockets, as also at times is done by some of our own syndicates of money-seekers masquerading too often as philanthropists.

[15] Fathers Paya and Saderra had appeared as witnesses before the first Commission.

Thus it was in the Philippines. Has the Judge never read of the "hemp trust" and "tobacco trust" engineered at Madrid in order to "bleed" the natives of Panay and Cagayan?

At Washington in the Library of Congress is a work of the Madrid press more than half a century old, that, with details in plenty relating to the olden time, shows up the sharp dealings of Caucasian exploiters in Luzon, Panay, Cebú, and other islands, during the last century and even earlier.[16] Here is merely one instance of many recorded in our *Diccionario* of State interference with Church matters to the great distress of souls. In 1831 (August 25), Sanctos Gómez Marañon, Augustinian, Bishop of Cebú —head city of the Visayas, petitioned Ferdinand VII of Spain (and *patrono real*) for a division of his see, which (the Bishop stated) covered an immense area of countless islands and waters reaching all through the Visayas, then eastwardly as far as the Marianas. His plea was based on the clear fact that the greater number of souls in his care could never be visited by him,—could not be confirmed through Holy Chrism.

Among other arguments in support of his plea, the Bishop relates that right after his consecration, he visited the isle of Romblón, and three provinces in Panay, where he confirmed 102,636 Christians; thence to the isle of Negros, then back to Cebú, where in one-half only of that island he confirmed (those of Panay included) 23,800 souls, though it took him one-half year for the task. Moreover, he pleads that his charge embraced a million at least of souls, scattered through many islands, of which he names only the larger, Romblón, Samar, Leite, Bohol, Surigao, Negros, Tablas, Sibuyan, Banton, Panay, and Cebú.

He prays then that a see be established with headquarters at the city of Santa Isabel of Jaro, in Panay isle, with care, too, of the Calamianes and Zamboanga in Mindanao—two regions that with the Marianas he had never been able to visit. This petition to the crown was in 1831. But Santa Isabel witnessed no bishop

[16] See *Diccionario Geográphico, Estadístico, Histórico de las Philipinas*, etc., [Madrid, 1850, in two vols.] by two Augustinian scientists, Manuel Buzeta and Felipe Bravo. Then, too, should be studied the *Estadismo* of that brave assailant of crown villainies in the Philippines,—the Augustinian traveller and chronicler Zuniga. [Retana ed., Madrid, 1893.]

of its own until thirty-four years later, when (on May 27, 1865), the then Sovereign Pontiff, Pius IX, created that see.[17]

With such shilly-shallying at court one need feel little surprise at the fact that for one hundred years or so the welfare of Christian missions in the East as well as elsewhere depended largely on the whims of bureaucrats at Madrid, who (at Lisbon as well) were apt to be in continual conflict with the Holy See on many a question of etiquette, etc., among them church preferments, benefices, and the like.

No. In the many statements of Judge Taft, that up to late times churchmen held "supreme power" in the Philippines, lies a grave blunder against history. Once, yes, many, many years ago, up to the close of about the eighteenth century, when the Church was in friendly alliance with Cæsar in spirituals and temporals, then, perhaps, you would have seen the pueblo-missions of Luzon and its sister-isles civilized, prosperous, happy, so well as to deserve the epithet "Pearl of Malaysia"—a picture of almost Utopian grandeur and ethic beauty, as was that other charming lovely Christian mission-field of the Jesuits in Paraguay.

Some Facts of Philippine Story.

Here, relative to old-time Philippine story, are a few facts that have been enshrined in the pages of many a chronicler.

1. As a rule, not a Spanish soldier in the Philippines, except maybe in Manila in garrison.

2. At no time had Spain over 5,000 peninsulars in the whole archipelago.

3. All the islands were policed by Indians—natives, under friars, who guarded them from Chinese pirates and Moros.

The writer opines that even yet Cebuans remember with loving reverence their heroic fighting missionary of three-quarters of a century ago, Julian Bermejo,[18] of the Augustinians, who, with

[17] For the plea in full of Bishop Marañon, see Buzeta-Bravo, *ut ante* [i, 543, 544].

[18] Wrongly named "Ruiz" in his otherwise manly and enthusiastic paper in defence of Philippine churchmen, "The Work of the Friars," by Stephen Bonsal, in *North American Review* for October, last year. [See pp. 449–460.] Mr. Bonsal's paper was republished a few months ago by the "International Catholic Truth Society," of New York.

his well-drilled *corps* of Indians, spearmen and bowmen, with his little fleet of ten armored *barangayanes*—a kind of war canoe, supplied with falconets, and even with a well-equipped signal-service (with telegraphs from village to village) along the coast, kept Visaya waters fairly clear of Mahometan Jolo corsairs. (Father Bermejo, who off and on was *cura* of several pueblos in Cebú from 1802 to 1848, died at Cebú in 1851, on April 30.)

4. Apart from the usual local outbreaks, generally in Tagaldom (some of them fierce enough), history shows an era almost unbroken of peace and comfort.

5. Everywhere in those islands for generations back to the re-discovery, schools sufficient in number for plain and forest natives.

6. Steadily without a break the population of the islands on the increase from the first general census in 1732 down.

Such are storied facts, all of public record, that it may be useful to consider in our study of Philippine problems. With money-grabbers and Voltaireans kept aloof from our Indians, they were fairly comfortable and happy, with their friar guardians as pioneers in the field of higher and nobler activities, as promoters of civilization, industries, arts, as upholders of law and order, of mission-churches, schools,—the self-same factors, in brief, who, with their advent to Malaysia in the sixteenth century, had borne thither with the blessings of spiritual Christian refinement the boons of material art also,—letters, trades, commerce.

But to conclude with this bit of philosophic analysis of our Commissioners' reports. We are told by the Doctor that in their solemn judicial assembly at Manila

"Every witness said what he wanted to, and the Commission cordially invited all kinds of witnesses to appear."[19] [*Schurman*, ii, vii.]—

a statement implying, as the reader will notice, utmost license of speech on the part of the witnesses for the prosecution. They

[19] Notice may here be taken of Dr. Schurman's fondness for broad and very indefinite generalizations, as "men of all classes," "all classes of the people," "all varieties of opinion," "all the great questions of the day," and "every witness said what he wanted to," etc. But does such use of "indefinites" accord fully with historical accuracy?

certainly seem to have gone beyond bounds. One of them, with almost flippant air, has even proclaimed the infamy of his own mother. [Don Felipe Calderón in *Sen. Doc.*, 139.] Others similarly speak to the dishonor of their own friends and relatives.

Yes. We can well believe that in this regard Dr. Schurman speaks truly—that "every witness said what he wanted." But in our Manila court was there no one—no officer then to call witnesses to order, to have them bridle their speech?

With this we close our sketch of the genesis of the two Commissions, and the mode of procedure observed by them,

"in the maintenance of order, peace, and public welfare," etc. [*Schurman*, i, 186.]

Preliminary Conclusions.

Preliminary to our conclusions thereon we think then the following points (inspired by these reports) have been proved, viz.: that as regards the defendants—

1. The field of testimony opened by the prosecution was practically unlimited.

2. The witnesses with the exception of fourteen, but in reality twelve, were many of them of the mere riff-raff of Manila, the most cosmopolitan city, it may be said, of Asia, if not of the world.

3. No testimony was barred, everything — hearsay, town-gossip, slander—all was admitted.

4. There was no proper representation for the defence.

5. No provision for the verification of "evidence."

6. None for cross-examination.

7. While some of the judges at least were on record as anti-defendants,—the whole proceeding therefore one of such legal unseemliness it would seem as in any court of review would inevitably call for rebuke, if not reversal of judgment.

APPENDIX.

Among the many very singular phenomena in the four volumes of the Philippine reports that merit special study we single out the following as of interest to our readers. They refer to—

1. The interrogatories employed by the Commissioners in their examination of native witnesses.

2. Character of native witnesses as described by their fellow-prosecutors.

3. School facilities and school work in the Philippines, etc.

Interrogatories Put to Native Witnesses.

As to the questions put by the second Commission to native witnesses we are told that they were determined by the Commission itself [*Sen. Doc.*, 255], though prepared by Judge Taft [*id.*, 197], then published in the Manila papers, besides being communicated to the witnesses in written or printed from. [*Id.*, 192 212.]

The questions, nineteen in number, were the following:[20]

1. How long have you lived in the Philippines?
2. In what parts of the islands have you lived?
3. How much personal opportunity had you before 1896 to observe the relations existing between the friars and the people of their parishes in a religious, in a social, and in a political way?
4. How many friars have you known personally?
5. From what class of society were they drawn in Spain?
6. What agricultural, or business, or residence property, in any part of the islands do you know from which any order of friars has derived income?
7. What political functions were actually exercised by the parish priests in the islands under Spanish rule?
8. What usually were the relations between the heads of the Spanish Government here and the heads of the Church?
9. What fees were actually collected by the parish priests for marriages, burials, and christenings? How were they fixed, if you know? What, if any, was the effect of such fees upon the marriages?
10. What was the morality of the friars as parish priests? How much opportunity have you had to observe? Can you give me instances? If so, please do so.
11. What do you think is the chief ground for hostility to the friars as parish priests? Does it exist against all the orders? Why the difference?
12. Charges have been made against the friars that many of their number have caused the deportation of Filipinos, members of their parishes, and that in some instances they were guilty of physical cruelty. What, if anything, do you know on the subject?
13. What is to be said of the morality of the native priests?
14. What as to their education and preparation to discharge clerical duties?

[20] In *Sen. Doc.*, 213–219, the questions are given in detail.

15. What do you think would be the result of an attempt of the friars to return to their parishes?

16. What do you think would be the effect in the islands of the appointment of an American archbishop?

17. What do you think of the establishment of schools in which opportunity would be given the ministers of any church to instruct the pupils in religion half an hour before the regular hour? Would this satisfy the Catholics of the islands in their desire to unite religion with education?

18. Will not the fact that parish priests, whoever they may be, will have no political functions, and no political influence, and must depend on the voluntary contributions of their parishioners for their support, very much change the relation of the priest to the people?

19. What do you think would be the effect of the Government expropriating the agricultural property justly belonging to the friars, paying what it is worth, selling it out in small parcels, and using the proceeds for a school fund?

Such, then, were the problems in various realms of science—in political economy, pedagogy, state-craft, etc., submitted to the native witnesses for solution—conundrums, the most of them, that might easily puzzle scholarly Caucasians, not to speak of an "ignorant, credulous, and childlike people," as Judge Taft has termed the inhabitants of the Philippines.

The reader will recall, moreover, that, according to the Judge's very emphatic declaration, the Philippine question was not "religious," but "merely political;" that "immorality," etc., was not concerned therein. Then, perhaps, in view of this deliberate oft-repeated protestation of the Judge, he will inquire, why should the Judge, when framing these interrogatories, have put into the heads of his friar-hating witnesses—Caucasian and Katipuneros—the very subjects even that he so steadily, so positively, had declared were "irrelevant?" Why, too, have paraded their answers? Was this movement, as well as others, decreed by the secret anti-Catholic propaganda of Manila, or maybe London? Katipuneros, it may be remarked, are members of a secret league in the Philippines, chiefly in Luzon, patterned on Masonic models. Herein, not very unlike other anti-Christian organizations, they are not apt to let such things as morals or church discipline trouble their conscience. Nor have Katipuneros ever been noted as steady church-goers any more than their white brethren of secret-society lodges in America and Europe.

Native or Mestizo Witnesses.

An important feature in these reports, as observed when making our analysis thereof, was the fact that the testimony of native or mestizo witnesses served largely as their basis.

We give here some select tributes to their worthlessness as citizens, men of business, etc.

Our quotations, the reader is to observe very closely, are not drawn from Spanish sources. They are taken from the testimony of the Commissioners' own Caucasian witnesses—anti-friars on the whole, the same as these natives. Following are several characterizations:

"The Chinese half-breeds are causing all the trouble." [Testimony of Edwin H. Warner, *Schurman*, ii, 19.]

"The disturbing element is really of mixed blood—the Chinese, and Japanese, and Tagalogs. . . . You can't conceive of a people where there is a worse mixture." [Test. of Neil McLeod, *id.*, ii, 41.]

". . . the worst race . . . the Chinese mestizo or half-caste . . . treacherous and unreliable, but they are smart . . . cunning." [Test. of Wm. A. Daland, *id.*, ii, 167.]

"There is no business morality among them (*the Chinese*) . . . the mestizos . . . are very tricky; you can't put much confidence in them." [Test. of R. W. Brown, *id.*, ii, 205.]

". . . the mestizo . . . is a bad lot right through." [Test. of H. D. C. Jones, *id.*, ii, 216.]

"Usually he (*the mestizo*) is a very mean sort of a man." [Test. of Edwin H. Warner, *id.*, ii, 199.]

Even the Judge himself makes this admission that

"the number of Filipinos who are fitted by nature, education, and moral stability to fill such (*judicial*) positions is very small. Very few can be found among them in whose integrity and ability business men have confidence." [*Taft*, 83.]

While the genial, upright describer of the Philippines, Mr. Sawyer, a resident there for fourteen years, employs these terms:

"I should not like to place (*he says*) my affairs in the hands of a Tagal lawyer, to trust my life in the hands of a Tagal doctor, nor to

purchase an estate on the faith of a Tagal surveyor's measurement." [21]

Thus has one half of the prosecution's own witnesses, we may say, spoken against the other half. The friars in the Philippines have been styled "an element of discord." But do the above gems of high-class anthropology—science of our fellow man—display any marked degree of harmony among the anti-defendants themselves?

Another point as to these friar-hating Malays—their testimony, which was accepted as legal and competent by our Commissioners. All through the evidence of these Filipinos—natives, half-breeds, or Chinese (given by both Commissioners in their reports), runs one continued strain of invective, obloquy, slander, against their former teachers and missionaries,—on the whole a parrot-like repetition, page after page, of street tales, gossip and hearsay, relating to what we may style the "Maria-Monk" kind of romances about "the secret life of churchmen," "church tariff extortions," "abuse of confessional secrets," etc., etc. Yet from this wearisome and long-spun-out sameness of language, in their testimony, the student, if he examines it closely, will note two very remarkable psychological phenomena, that will prove incentives to considerable reflection thereon. One is the fact that apparently through some singular secret and mysterious influence these "ignorant, uneducated" hillsmen and plainsmen of Luzon all have employed almost the very same turns of thought, the very same figures of speech, the very same references to past events, even of ages ago, and so on. [See *Sen. Doc.* for the testimony of these native witnesses from Felipe Calderón's, p. 133, to Francisco Alvarez's, p. 265.] One somewhat amusing instance of this peculiar "thought coincidence," as we may call it, is the reference by as many as eight native witnesses, among them our "headmen and leading residents" of Aringay, to the case of Archbishop Sancho in the eighteenth century.[22]

[21] *The Inhabitants of the Philippines*, by Frederic H. Sawyer, etc., New York, 1900 (p. 237), a book well worth reading for its keen observations of matters and things in general in those islands.

[22] See in *Sen. Doc.* the testimony of the following: Torres, 186; Ros, 194; the Aringay delegation, 200; Templo, 208; del Fierro, 214; Mercado, 251; Mijares, 254; Alvarez, 258.

The experience of this prelate—Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa y Santa Rufina, an Aragonese, member of the Pious Schools, and for twenty years Archbishop of Manila, from 1767 to 1787, when he died, has so far sufficed for his successors in that see.

Through a fancy that hitherto native talents had somehow wrongly been kept hidden, the Archbishop, who, when in Spain, had displayed great activity in the suppression of Jesuits—(it was the era of the new infidel re-birth [?] of Europe)—withdrew all regulars in the Philippines from parish care, and gave their charges to native incumbents. These Indians were ordained by him in such numbers as to give rise to a saying at Manila that

"*Que no se encontraban bogadores para los pancos, porque a totos los habia ordenado el arzobispo,*"

—"One need not look any longer for boatmen, as the Archbishop has ordained them all." With this result in brief, as to his chagrin the Archbishop discovered shortly after while on a visit throughout Luzon, that the missions had gone to wreck and ruin —churches, schools, *conventos*, libraries, all in decay.

Not long after, the European regulars were restored to their former duties as *parrocos*, with the natives as formerly coadjutors.[23]

Could it be possible, then, and yet nothing easier might have happened, that all these Katipuneros (Caucasians even included) were carefully drilled beforehand as to their anti-friar evidence—were in brief "coached," though rather stupidly, as sometimes our court chronicles declare is done here?

The other psychological phenomenon discloses to us on analysis a no less singular instance of what I might style, in default of perhaps a neater term, "thought transference," or "psychical absorption." The reports of Judge Taft contain the testimony of several Luzonians, wherein, interlarded with their anti-friar evidence, are some pure Americanisms, such as the semi-slang expression "O. K," that exceedingly quickly, it appears, had been introduced by these Filipinos into their native speech after an acquaintanceship with Americans of only a few months. The "O.K."

[23] Sketches of this era may be read in *Estadismo* (*ut supra*), by the Augustinian Zuñiga, [Retana ed, ii, 279]. It is referred to also by Buzeta-Bravo—*Diccionario* [ii, 278 *b*].

enters into the testimony of at least four islanders.[24] Or, may be —an explanation that will suggest itself to our mind—maybe the testimony itself of these uncultured folk was just "cooked." Enough, however, for these native witnesses, who seem therein something like our own half-breeds at home, of various colors, the same as in Malaysia.

Long ago European churchmen in the Philippines were not slow in learning of the character of those islanders, that among racial peculiarities they were given to many virtues—to piety, devotion, obedience, and in subordinate positions even trustworthiness. Herein, I may observe, they are not very unlike our own North American Indians. But the churchmen learned besides that their wards, however docile and really faithful, were apt to get "out of gear" with any regular system of life, to show themselves flighty-minded, changeable, when one would least expect it.

So as the Church has always recognized the advantages of having a native clergy, co-workers with Europeans on missionary lines, these natives, little by little, were raised to sacred orders, as assistants, coadjutors, under the eye, however, of a Spaniard, to preach, instruct, visit the sick, and administer the Sacraments of Holy Church. But as a rule natives were not admitted to higher offices. The experience of Archbishop Sancho was a lesson for good. Nor was any native ever raised to the episcopate, unless at the most as coadjutor. Nor, for similar reasons too, did the orders in all these centuries admit natives to the habit of their brotherhood but rarely. Since the year 1641, as far as I can discover, the Augustinians have invested with their religious garb only 43 Indians, among them the skilled botanist, Father Ignacio Mercado, a mestizo of Parañaque (born in 1648, died at Bauan in 1698), Dominicans, 25; Franciscans, 16; Recoletos, about 25.

Pueblo Schools in the Philippines, etc.

Common schools for Indians were established, of record, in every Christianized district of these vast archipelagos, as adjuncts to their pueblo churches—feeders, too, in a way of the many institutions of higher learning already named in these pages—colleges,

[24] See in *Sen. Doc.* for the "O. K." the testimony of Tayera, 159 *bis.*; Templo, 205; Mercado, 250; Alvarez, 256.

seminaries, *beaterios*. Let the reader recall the words of Judge Taft in speaking of the chief inspectors and superintendents of these little pueblo shrines of the Christian Minerva, that the priests, " men of intelligence and education," were " many of them gentlemen of high moral standards."

As to the mass of literature, too, in the Philippines bearing on the higher sciences, industries and arts, these are noted in the Commissioners' reports only by their utterly unexplainable absence. Neither Dr. Schurman, nor Judge Taft, seems to have been acquainted with Philippine bibliography, even by name, or aware even faintly of the many gems of literature in those islands in such diverse fields as history and mechanics, linguistics and music, theology and physics, with a lot more on poetry, folk-lore, and so on. This absence of one of the brilliant intellectual glories of the Philippines (in the Commissioners' reports) is another of the several *lacunae* noticed in their works.

Nor do they seem to have been aware of this other fact that during the closing years of the sixteenth century, when the earliest printing-press of record in the Philippines was set up in Luzon, Manila hailed its first publication, not (as believed by many) the Tagal *Arte* of the Dominican philologist Blancas, in 1602, nor the *tratadillos* that issued from the convent-press of the Augustinians at Lubao in 1606, but two booklets instead on Christian Doctrine, —*doctrinas*, as they were entitled, one in Tagal and Spanish, the other in Chinese, both printed, or rather xylographed, from blocks, at Manila, or its suburb, Binondo, in 1593. Positive evidence of these publications (no longer, however, extant) is in Simancas *Archivo*, among the state papers of Philip II,—a letter of official character, of June 20, 1593, addressed to that monarch by Gómez Pérez Dasmariñas, Governor-General of the Philippines.[25]

Moreover, bibliographers of the Philippines record the titles of 3000 works and upwards, many of them reëditions, that relate to matters and things in those islands. In his *Imprenta* Retana gives a list of Philippina with their titles, name of author, printer, with date and place of publication from 1593 (as said) to

[25] Thus the bibliophile Retana, in his story of the Philippine press, *La Imprenta en Filipinas* [1593–1810], Madrid, 1897 (p. 5.), where he states that he read the Dasmariñas letter, published also (he remarks) by his fellow antiquarian Medina.

1810. For the sixteenth century two works are named,—the *Doctrinas*, of Binondo; for the seventeenth, 150; for the eighteenth, 341; while in the nineteenth century, during its nine opening years, 24 works were printed, or a total in all of 517 books, which, with 24 others of doubtful date, make 541 monuments of the printing art in Luzon, up to the year 1810. Among these philological treasures are twenty-three *Artes*, or grammars, in Tagal, Pampango, Ilocano, Bicol, Bisaya-Hiligayna, Bisaya of Leyte and Samar, and Pangasinan; then eleven dictionaries, one in Japanese, another in the dialect of Tankui, a tribe of Indians in an out-of-the-way place in the Zambales country around Subig bay in Luzon. The other dictionaries are in Tagal, Bisaya, Pampango, and Bicol.[26]

Now of all this and similar evidence concerning education and intellectual activities in the Philippines, which it seems the spirit of ordinary honesty would not have excluded from their reports, not one word even has been recorded by the Commissioners. "But really they were not supposed to turn antiquarians." Very true. Why then have loaded the pages of their reports with references to archæological—old-time iniquities—scandals largely, however, mere oriental fairy-tales, to the discredit of contemporaneous churchmen? (Scientific antiquarianism, like any other art, works both ways.)

But with this not very irrelevant digression on books, we return to our pueblo schools, rather low-grade educational centres however, established throughout our Christian Malaysia, yet withal very helpful agencies, along with their much nobler fellow institutions of far higher rank in the capitals of the Luzon provinces, in uplifting these islanders to fairly civilized planes. For (be it stoutly said) old-time writers as well as modern, visitors, travellers, sojourners, even non-Catholic, descant in sometimes glowing terms of praise for the marvels of ethic grandeur among these Christian Malays, their many personal and social virtues, the air of general peacefulness in their pueblos, their hospitality towards strangers, respect for authority, safety of travel by day or

[26] Something of interest relating to books, etc., in these Malaysian archipelagos, will be found in a pamphlet (by the writer) published by the Free Library of Philadelphia, in 1900. [See *Some Notes on Philippine Bibliography*, etc.]

night, and, above all, the modesty of their women. So that it is easily credible that in many provinces illiteracy was so uncommon that (as told by many an annalist) "you'd barely find boy or girl that couldn't read and write."[27]

As pertinent to pedagogy, therefore to ethics, the writer has the following experience from the lips of an old Philippine resident: that "though (such are his words) he travelled at times through the principal islands—Luzon, Panay, Cebú—in all his sojourn he never once at night fastened the door of his sleeping chamber; never heard of molestation to traveller in mountain-pass, forest, plain, or highway; nor even of thievery, let alone robbery, or other violence to person or property."

But with this digression we get back to our 2140 literary oases in these tropical lands, where instruction suitable to native needs was given pretty much anywhere—in *convento*—solid building, or nipa hut; it mattered little, so long as school kept in.

And here is the schedule of studies, adopted by these little Indian science and trade schools, as recorded by Dr. Schurman:

PUEBLO SCHOOL-COURSE IN THE PHILIPPINES, ETC.

"Instruction in schools for natives shall for the present be reduced to elementary-primary instruction and shall consist of—

1. Christian doctrine and principles of morality and sacred history suitable for children.
2. Reading.
3. Writing.
4. Practical instruction in Spanish, including grammar and orthography.
5. Principles of arithmetic, comprising the four rules for figures, common fractions, decimal fractions, and instruction in the metric system with its equivalents in ordinary weights and measures.
6. Instruction in general geography and Spanish history.
7. Instruction in practical agriculture as applied to the products of the country.
8. Rules of deportment.
9. Vocal music." [*Schurman*, i, 31.]

[27] Thus Buzeta, in his *Diccionario* (*ut ante*, i, 161 *b*), relates of Hilarion Diez, the Augustinian provincial of his order, as well as Archbishop of Manila in 1826, who was wont to say that there was a multitude of pueblos, as Argao, Dalaguete, Boljoón in Cebú, and many in the province of Iloilo—"*en los que es difícil hallar un solo niño ó niña que no sepa leer y escribir.*"

That is to say, in the islands were the following boys' schools and others devoted exclusively to girls, of the four-fold grade—*entrada* (or entrance primary-schools), then *ascenso*, *termino de secunda*, and *termino de primera*.

	BOYS'.	GIRLS'.	TOTAL.
Philippines	1082	1047	2129
Marianas	2	2	4
East Carolines	2	2	4
West Carolines	2	1	3
	1088	1052	2140

Our Philippine Indians then,—and are they really so different from their red brethren here?—seem to have been fairly well provided with technical learning, enough at least for their duties of life. They were taught to be honest, upright men and women; to rule their households justly; to honor God; to begin and end the day with prayer; to tell no lies; and thus be contented and happy in spirit. (Old histories tell of the Philippines that the natives were a joyful, happy, light-hearted people.) "But it is not high-class education!" Maybe not. Yet our civil-service commissioners, it seems, would gladly welcome a school-course just as good.

As regards the system of Philippine education too the student of pedagogy must reflect that, except some pueblo "lock-ups"—*carcels*, in the islands were no state-prisons (except at Manila), no asylums for indigents, no penitentiaries, no houses of refuge, no poor-houses, no reformatories (except the Magdalen Retreat at Manila), and, to the glory of Philippine Christianity be it said, until a very few years ago, no houses of disorderly character.[28]

Nor were there any truant-officers in the Philippines,—all adjuncts pretty much of modern civilization as inspired and much regulated, and greatly tinkered with by our *doctrinaire* politicians.

And here is the law requiring attendance at school, from the same Commissioner's reports:

[28] At Manila houses of ill-fame were officially protected (otherwise licensed) first in or about 1888, under José Centeno y Garcia, Civil Governor *ad interim*. (From *The Katipunan, or the Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune*. By Francis St. Clair. Manila: Tip. "Amigos del Pais," Palacio 258. 1902. [Pp. 61, 65.]

LAW OBLIGING SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

Primary instruction is obligatory for all natives. The fathers, tutors, or guardians of children shall send them to the public schools between the ages of 10 and 12 years, unless they prove that they give them sufficient instruction in their homes or in private schools. Those who do not obey this rule shall be admonished by the authorities, and compelled to do so by a fine of from one-half real to 2 reals (3 to 13 cents gold at the present rate of exchange !), *when there is a school in the town at such a distance that the children can conveniently attend.* The fathers and guardians of children *may* also send them to the schools between the ages of 6 and 14 years. [*Schurman*, i, 32.][29]

In praise of these petty pueblo schools, of their curriculum and general proficiency as educational agencies, despite many drawbacks (noticed by Dr. Schurman) on the part of civil—official—intermeddling, we have these testimonials, all from the prosecution's own witnesses :

"In the different provinces there are lawyers and doctors, and professional men who are very well educated." [Test. of J. F. McLeod in *Schurman*, ii, 9.]

While in answer to the question: "What proportion of the people of Batangas can read and write ?" Señor Felipe Gonçalez Calderón says:

"Seventy-five or eighty per cent. The province is the most cultured in the Archipelago. I have some 600 laborers on my plantation in Batangas, and of these there are certainly not more than twenty who cannot read and write." [Test. *id.*, ii, 67, 68.]

Even Judge Taft himself, though (as usual) in rather begrudging terms, admits that the Filipinos,

"as a rule, . . . possess mechanical skill, and they excel in writing and drawing." [*Taft*, 105.]

Then, too, that

"the Filipinos are born musicians, and, under normal conditions, buy a good many pianos." [*Id.*, 61.]

(In our own Indian schools "out West," I wonder whether our aborigines are taught drawing and music? or have they "many pianos" in their pueblos ?)

[29] In the "school law" printed above the sentence in curved lines (with the exclamation mark) and the italics seem to be Dr. Worcester's ; the paper in this volume on "Education" having been compiled by him.

Enough admissions, we think, that the Philippines had schools, plenty of them, where pupils were taught even fine arts thoroughly as well as industrial, but above all good behavior, which for colored or white men is all essential for happy life. But had the Commissioners been really in earnest in search for evidence of good school work to add to their reports thereon, that have been by some enthusiasts styled as "complete, elaborate, sound,"[30] —evidence, too, of the strongest character throughout all those isles, that was before their very eyes to be seen even yet by all men, though much of it no doubt is now in ruins, they would have described at least briefly the handiwork of those missionary pedagogues and their pueblo alumni to be witnessed in the roads and bridges, in the irrigating and drainage canals, in the swamp and forest lands reclaimed for tillage, in the pueblo churches, and pueblo convents, and pueblo buildings, all erected by those self-same industrious and skilful natives, who, whether slaves and peons, as pictured by romancers, or freemen like our own American aborigines (it matters little), were yet taught honest labor,—the elements at least, of useful and beautiful arts, the way to keep to their task, to labor, too, with a sense of nobleness and pride, as shown in their monuments, and (be it emphasized sturdily) their handiwork shows that they learned their business well.

And evidence of still higher character? Then, too, in all fairness should have been described by our Commissioners the many exemplars of architecture, painting, and sculpture, in Manila, and elsewhere in Cebú and Iloilo, in carving and engraving and chiselling, in dwellings, in town-halls, in church and school-buildings, all tokens of native skilfulness these, due in large meas-

[30] A few months ago we chanced to look over a paper—a kind of semi-political canonization of Judge Taft—in a prominent periodical (*North American* [monthly] for September, 1902, pp. 229–308, for "The New Philippine Government," by Sidney Webster), wherein, with some amazement, because of the unqualified and superlative admiration for the Judge, we read the following eulogies relating to his report, which is styled "elaborate . . . based on an official examination by Governor (*then Commissioner*) Taft . . ." Moreover, that "it is to be relied upon by the country, one would say, as presenting essential facts and sound conclusions." [P. 305.] In view, however, of some other "essential" facts that we have shown have been omitted by that self-same Judge, the writer in question is asked, in all seriousness, whether really he has ever studied Judge Taft's reports; or, he will excuse us for adding, did he ever even read them through?

ure to the benign and art-loving influence derived from their little pueblo schools through the painstaking energy of their *parrocos*, officers, guardians of their numerous church, social, and educational guilds.[31]

Yet, if we mistake not, so busy were the Commissioners with their investigations into Church political matters, they failed to recognize these art-grandeurs before their very eyes. For, though the scholarly taste of the Commissioners might not have cared much for mere material beauty, tastiness, skill, their broad judicial spirit, however, should not, we opine, have omitted some brief tribute at least to our ecclesiastical æsthetes in the Philippines.

Thus do we enshrine in our pages another collection of judicial *lacunae* relating to the elevating and ennobling influence in lofty ethical training given in those pueblo schools, working through the agency of religion to develop Christian manliness and womanliness, wherein rightly much is to be admired, nor little, if aught, to be greatly ashamed of.

But what do the Commissioners mean in saying

"From the beginning the (*pueblo*) schools were entirely under the supervision of the religious orders." [*Taft*, 105.]

When, as any student of Philippine or Spanish history should know, for the last one hundred years or so, school schedules, rules, and programmes, etc., in those islands, the same pretty much as in the rest of Caucasia, have been tinkered at by theorists of various political colors?

Or this of Dr. Schurman's, who, speaking of the weather remarks that

"it is often quite impossible for small children to attend school . . . on account of their distance from it . . ." [*Schurman*, i, 31.]

[31] In *El Archipiélago*, by Jesuit scholars, a large work of encyclopædical character, published by Government [Washington, 1900], and in *Gazetteer* (described ahead), we exult in the preservation through photographic views of very many of these monuments of ripe, cultured spirit, some so tasty, so majestic in appearance as to seem to our Western spirit masterpieces in a way of art-genius.

Well. In bad weather even in Pennsylvania "small children" (and big ones too) find it "impossible to attend" their own pueblo schools. Are churchmen, therefore, to be blamed for the weather in the Philippines, and the pupils' non-attendance therefore?

Then Dr. Worcester says that

"The only educational advantages obtainable by the common people of the Archipelago are those afforded by the primary schools." [*Schurman*, i, 17.]

No doubt. Even in our largest cities here in America, what other means of education than their own pueblo common schools has the great mass of white Tagals—the bread-winners of the world in mill, forge, mine and factory?

Again we find the Doctor complaining that

"the instruction in Spanish was in very many cases purely imaginary," . . . [*Id.* i, 31.]

No wonder. It's just like those bad Katipuneros to make this charge against our mission schools. Still has not Dr. Worcester heard at times that our own civil-service examiners find fault frequently with not only our pueblo schools, but institutions even of higher name, for very similar neglect?

But let us on to the end of our paper with the words of Judge Taft:

". . . the Philippine people belong to the Roman Catholic Church." [*Taft*, 23.]

"The Philippine people love the Catholic Church." [*Id.*, 30.]

And

"As the Catholic Church is and ought to continue a prominent factor in the life, peace, contentment, and progress of the Philippine people, . . . it would seem the wisest course, . . . to frame civil laws which shall accord with views conscientiously entertained by Catholics —priests and laymen . . ." [*Id.*, 33.]

Brave words these. Here at least we agree with the Judge, for, as in the past in Malaysia and elsewhere, as attested by the history of mankind, so in the future we heartily believe the only bulwark of law and order will be the Church of our forefathers, that ever has been the promoter of works leading to the higher life—of virtues, of heroisms, of letters, of sciences, of arts, which

find their complement in the fullest and noblest degree in monuments of all-round beneficence—in Christian schools, Christian asylums, Christian homes; monuments that in their grandeur and multitude and variety can be witnessed in no other land but Christian, in neither Moslem, Buddhist, nor heathen.

Final Conclusion.

To sum up then our conclusions. At the outset of this paper we charged the Philippine Commissioners with prejudice against the defendants. And we attacked their reports on many grounds as faulty for incompleteness, for inaccuracies, for unfairness—a kind of indictment, if you choose so to style it, that hinges on the twofold ground of faults of omission, faults of commission, in that the Commissioners kept in the background, out of sight, whatever evidence might make for the defendants, while at the same time they admitted—brought forward as evidence whatever would make for the prosecution.

Are we wrong, therefore, in contending that these reports cannot stand as historical documents on the score of omissions in matters of weighty importance; nor stand as judicial decisions on the score of manifold antagonisms therein against the defendant churchmen, against the evidence itself of the prosecution's own witnesses, against the evidence, too, of the Commissioners' own eyes?

Fr. Thomas C. Middleton, O.S.A.
Villanova College, Pa.

THE UNION OF THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH WITH THE HOLY ROMAN SEE.

AMONG writers upon early Irish history there is much diversity of views regarding the character of primitive Christianity established in the island by St. Patrick. Protestant historians have been at great pains to show that the Gospel preached by the Saint was not that which the Roman Catholic Church claims as her traditional creed; nay, some of them affect to disprove the truth of what our own Church historians generally accept as an estab-

lished fact, namely that St. Patrick received his mission to the inhabitants of Ireland directly from the Roman Pontiff.

The statement, supported by the "Book of Armagh," that Pope Celestine commissioned the Saint to go to Ireland, is met by Dr. Todd, of Dublin,[1] with an attempt to show that St. Patrick was not sent to Ireland until at least eight years after Celestine's death; Sir William Bethan[2] declares it as quite certain, that the Saint reached the shores of Ireland centuries before Celestine was born; while the ingenious Ledwich, not to be outdone in originality, asserts confidently that St. Patrick never existed at all, and that he and his apostolate should be relegated to the realms of myth and fable. With Irish Protestants of to-day Ledwich's bold theory is not much in favor. They rather prefer to retain St. Patrick; and to mould his life and teachings, so as best to support the latter-day claims of that moribund institution which arrogates to itself the title of the "Church of Ireland." And indeed Ussher, though he admits that St. Patrick received his mission from Pope Celestine, tells us, nevertheless, that the doctrine taught by the Saint was pure and simple Protestantism, and that, whatever injunctions he had from the Pope, as a matter of fact he established a Church which remained for centuries entirely independent of the Apostolic See.

Although the origin of these extravagant opinions classed as history, dates back to the time of Ussher, that is, the seventeenth century, they did not obtain much credence until about thirty years ago, when Irish Protestants, in view of threatening disestablishment and disendowment of their Church, sought to confirm their claims to State-patronage by showing the identity of Protestantism with the Primitive Irish Church of St. Patrick. Thus, all at once, Ussher's theory became immensely popular. From the hustings, from the Opposition benches of the House of Commons, from the class halls of Dublin University, from the pulpits of the Established Church, the Protestantism of ancient Ireland was asserted with such dogmatic confidence that it was caught up as political war-cry, and was echoed, and reëchoed loudly and universally, till Protestant Irishmen brought themselves actually

[1] *St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland.* By James H. Todd. Dublin, 1864.

[2] *Irish Antiquarian Researches.* Dublin, 1827.

to believe it. Ever since then, the Irish Church Mission Society, and the Religious Tract Society, as well as the more bigoted and aggressive country parsons, shutting their eyes to the overwhelming mass of historical evidence against them, have insisted upon the identity of their Church with the Church that honors St. Patrick, St. Bridget, and St. Columkille.

In refutation of these pretensions I propose, in a cursory reference to Irish annals, to show that from its establishment the Irish Church was, in doctrine, government, and discipline, in perfect conformity with the Church of Rome. My principal object will be to direct attention to her acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff; and I insist on this particular point for two very substantial reasons. In the first place because it is a fact which the opponents of traditional Irish Catholicity most strenuously contest. In the second place it really touches the core of the difference between the Catholic Church and all the sects that claim the Christian name in Ireland. Hence by showing that the Irish Church acknowledged from the beginning and uninterruptedly the supremacy of the Apostolic See, we obtain proof positive that she held to all the doctrines and the chief disciplinary practices of the Church of Rome. My thesis is therefore, that the Irish Church was established at the command and under the auspices of the Roman Pontiff; and further, that the Papal authority in Ireland was acknowledged and enforced from the very beginning of the establishment of Christianity. To illustrate both contentions, in which I mean to be very brief, I shall also examine what were the actual doctrines held in the early Irish Church, and to demonstrate their agreement with those that were then, are now, and till the end of time shall be, taught and believed in the Roman Catholic Church.

That the Irish Church was established under the direction of the Pope, or, what comes to the same thing, that St. Patrick came to Ireland with a Papal commission, is so well attested by the earliest and best authorities, that Ussher, despite his prejudices, did not venture to deny it. The learned Dr. Todd of Trinity, in a work published little more than thirty years ago, was, as already stated, the first to reject the ancient tradition of the Irish Church, and he did so, as he informs us in the preface of his work,

on the ground that the evidence for it was not satisfactory in his eyes. I hope to show that the Roman mission of St. Patrick admits of abundant proof from the best authority.

It has, I think, been conclusively established by Dr. Graves, Protestant Bishop of Limerick, that the "Book of Armagh" could not have been written later than A.D. 807, though it might, as the learned O'Curry asserts, have originated a century earlier. In one of the MSS. of which this ancient record is made up and which is known as "Tirechan's Annotations," we read: "The Bishop Patrick was sent by Celestine, Bishop and Pope of Rome, to correct the Irish. This Celestine was the forty-fifth successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome." It is to be noted that this testimony of an ancient and venerable authority is very explicit in its simplicity, and has no trace of forgery about it. Thus it carries great historical weight.

Amongst the seven most ancient "Lives" of St. Patrick still extant, there is one in the British Museum, known as the "Tripartite." It was translated by Colgan from the old Gaelic original ascribed to St. Evin, who is generally admitted to have lived in the century succeeding that of St. Patrick. St. Evin says: "It was Celestine, Abbot of Rome, who read *grada* (orders) over him; Germanus and Amatho, the Romans, being present." The fourth Life of St. Patrick was written by St. Aileran, called "The Wise," who, according to the Four Masters, died in 664. St. Aileran writes, "Wherefore St. Germanus sent the Blessed Patrick to Rome, that with the permission of the Bishop of the Apostolic See he might go forth to preach, *for order so requireth.* But Patrick, having arrived at Rome, was most honorably received by the Holy Pope Celestine, and the relics of the Saint being delivered to him *he was sent into Ireland by Pope Celestine.*" This unequivocal testimony, from an early and reliable authority, would require no comment. It not only testifies to St. Aileran's belief that St. Patrick received his mission from the Roman Pontiff, but also that the Roman Pontiff was supreme over all the churches and missions; for what else can be the meaning of the words "for order so requireth"?

Another and very important witness strengthening our argument is Eric of Auxerre, a French monk of the ninth century.

He wrote a Life of St. Germanus of Auxerre, from whom it is generally believed St. Patrick received his religious and secular education. Speaking incidentally of St. Patrick in this work, Eric says, "Germanus sent him to holy Celestine, the Pope of the city of Rome, accompanied by his own priest Legetius, who might bear testimony of his ecclesiastical probity at the Apostolic See." Now Eric could have had no possible motive in fabricating or sustaining a particular theory about St. Patrick. He was a Frenchman, a stranger to Ireland, and his purpose was simply to give a true account of his fellow-countryman, St. Germanus. Yet here we have him, wholly uninfluenced by Irish tradition or by national prejudice, giving us the clear and independent testimony of St. Patrick's commission from Pope Celestine.

The testimonies I have briefly quoted are confirmed by the remaining celebrated biographies of St. Patrick written by St. Benignus, by Probus, by Nennius (in his history of the Britains), by Marcus, by Marianus, as also the history contained in the Annals of Innisfallen, by the scholastic who in the seventh century commented on St. Fiacc's Hymn (metrical Life of St. Patrick), and by quite a host of later writers. The conclusion is plain, for negative proofs are not sufficient to overthrow these very positive testimonies asserting that St. Patrick came to Ireland at the command of Pope Celestine.

But let us glance for a moment at what may he justly termed the negative arguments of those who deny the Catholic claim. The first of these arguments is deduced from the extant writings of St. Patrick. It is stated that the Saint's *language* is inconsistent with a Roman mission. If we ask what the precise "language" to which our adversaries refer, is, we learn that it is something *he did not say.* In other words, they argue thus: St. Patrick's Confession and his Epistle to Coroticus contain *no reference to his Roman mission.* Therefore the Roman mission was not a fact!

The argument speaks for itself; but it may be stated in addition that in the writings referred to there is no call whatever for a mention of St. Patrick's mission. The "Confession" was written by the Saint in his old age, when the great work of his life had been happily accomplished; in it he proposes to return thanks to God for the wonderful graces bestowed on himself, and on the

Irish nation; he takes occasion to exhort his spiritual children to perseverance, and in conclusion defends himself against some charges of presumption and incompetency made against him by his enemies. Though the "Confession" contains many facts of the Saint's early life, it is quite clear that it was never intended to be an autobiography. It was a *Confession* in the sense of a profession of faith or a testament in which there was no particular occasion to refer to his Roman mission. Dr. Todd thinks that an appeal to a commission from Rome would have been an unanswerable reply to those who charged St. Patrick with presumption in undertaking the conversion of Ireland. But it must be remembered that if the "Confession" was addressed to men who admitted the Papal supremacy, an appeal to a commission from Rome would have been quite unnecessary; and if addressed to those who denied or cared nothing for the Pope's supremacy, then such an appeal would have been useless. Certainly, if his enemies had charged against the Saint that he had undertaken his work without due authorization, then indeed, an appeal to a commission from the Apostolic See would have been an unanswerable reply. But such is not the case.

The main charge against the Saint apparently was that such a lowly and ignorant person as Patrick should have presumed *to seek or accept* this onerous duty of preaching the Gospel. Our great Apostle replies in a strain worthy of the pen of St. Paul. The keynote of his whole contention is an appeal to the goodness and omnipotence of Him who makes use of the weak things of this world to confound the strong. Like the Apostle of Nations he glories but in his own infirmities. He admits, he dilates on, his own lowliness, his sinfulness; and then pointing to the magnificent results that crowned his labors he confutes his accusers by asking whether the weak wretch that they took him justly to be, could have produced such effects without a divine vocation to his arduous task, or without divine aid in its execution. His sole object is to show that the finger of the Omnipotent was in his work, his sole desire that the glory of his success might be given to God. "I pray," concludes the "Confession," "that whatever little I have done or administered may not be referred to me, but be ye persuaded, and verily believe that it was the gift of God."

An appeal to a Roman mission would have been out of harmony with such a defence, since it would have emphasized the fact from which his humility shrank, namely, that the Head of the Universal Church had deemed him worthy and capable of so great a task by reason of some personal endowment. It was much more like the Saint to *exaggerate*, if I may say so, his own incompetency, in order that all the greater glory might be given to God.

A similar argument drawn from the silence of the "Epistle against Coroticus" scarcely deserves a serious reply. This Epistle was directed against a Welsh chieftain, who, though nominally a Christian, was leading a life of wanton piracy and plunder, murdering and despoiling the Saint's Christian neophytes. St. Patrick having denounced the excesses of this renegade appeals to his own Apostolic power of binding and loosing by excomunicating the offender. Surely there was here no call for a reference to his Roman mission, which was simply taken for granted.

Other Irish records, which, because of what they do *not* say, are adduced as proof that St. Patrick did not receive his commission from the Holy See, are the Hymns of *St. Sechnall*, *St. Fiacc's* metrical life of St. Patrick, and the tract by *Muirchu-Maccu-Mactheni*, in the Book of Armagh. As regards the hymn of St. Sechnall, it is to be noted that the reading of the third stanza is doubtful. The word "Petrus" occurring in that stanza might be "Petrum." If we read "Petrus"—and it appears to be the reading of the best MSS., such as the "Leabhar Breac," the Dublin MS. of the "Book of Hymns," and a famous Roman MS.,—then this stanza declares St. Patrick to be, "constant in the faith as Peter, upon whom the Church is built, *and of whose apostolate he was made partaker by God*, against whom the powers of hell cannot prevail." This reading offers as explicit a reference to a commission from the See of Peter as could be expected in a poem of the kind. But, waiving the advantage which the somewhat doubtful text offers, we need only once more appeal to the natural scope of these writings of St. Sechnall or St. Fiacc. Neither of them meant to write exhaustive biographies of our national Apostle. The long and important period of about forty years, between the end of St. Patrick's captivity and the beginning of the Irish

Apostolate, St. Fiacc sums up in *thirty-three words.* Surely in so meagre a sketch it was natural to omit all reference to such facts as a commission from the Holy See. The silence of St. Sechnall (if we are to admit his absolute silence) is satisfactorily accounted for in a similar manner. He is, as the opening words of his poem state, the panegyrist, not the biographer of his beloved master. And what he says is comprised in less than a hundred lines, which hardly permit a reference to such details as the Saint's apostolic commission, much less do they call for its mention.

As to the argument drawn from the apparent silence of Mactheni, we may be brief.

It is well known that a considerable portion of that valuable tract has most unaccountably disappeared, within the last two hundred years; and indeed there is sufficient evidence to show that the lost portion contained an account of the Roman mission. For why should Ussher, so evidently bigoted in his references to St. Patrick's Catholic standpoint, admit that the Roman mission of St. Patrick is unanimously attested by the historians of the Saint's life? The inference is plain: he could not have done otherwise, for Mactheni's tract was still intact in his day.

In fact the titles of the lost chapters have been happily preserved. One of them is "De aetate ejus (Patricii) quando *iens videre Sedem Apostolicam* voluit discere sapientiam." We strongly suspect that if this chapter had not so mysteriously vanished, our adversaries should have to look elsewere for evidence against St. Patrick's Roman mission. No one who approaches the critical study of Patrician literature without bias doubts that the Life of St. Patrick known as that of Probus, is simply a revised version of Mactheni's text. And Probus bears very explicit testimony to the Roman mission; hence we have at least a strong presumption, that similar testimony was contained in that ever-to-be-regretted lost chapter of Mactheni.

The chief positive argument against St. Patrick's Roman mission has been drawn from Dr. Todd's "corrected" chronology. The learned doctor, in his once famous "Memoir of St. Patrick," set out to show that the Saint could not have reached our shores before the year 440, and therefore could not have had a commission from Pope Celestine, who died in 432. In support of his

theory, Dr. Todd puts forth a number of arguments, involving an intricate process of arithmetic and based upon some doubtful passages in certain old Irish records. These arguments have been completely refuted by Cardinal Moran, who shows that the old records to which Dr. Todd refers do in reality reckon St. Patrick's apostolate from the year 432. A similar attempt to extort a proof against the Saint's apostolic mission from the text of the Epistle to Coroticus, was ably answered by Dr. Gargan, of Maynooth, who demonstrated that the view maintained by the best authorities on Irish history, such as Ussher, Ware, Colgan, O'Curry, Petrie, had not met with any honest or critical refutation. This view was consistently supported by all the old records, the book of Armagh, the Leabhar Breac, the Cronicum Scotorum, the Annals of Ulster, the Annals of Innisfallen, the Four Masters, Marianus Scotus, together with the existing biographies of the Saint. All these agree so well about the date as to force from Dr. Todd himself the statement which he seeks to subvert, that "The Irish annals *with singular unanimity* give A. D. 432 as the date of his consecration and arrival as Bishop of Ireland." It must then be admitted as a fact attested as clearly as any in our history, that Christianity was introduced into Ireland directly from Rome, the fountainhead of Catholic orthodoxy.

It would be easy to quote copiously from the writings of the early Irish Saints and chroniclers, to show the sentiments of devoted loyalty and filial reverence entertained by the early Irish Christians towards the Apostolic See. There are numerous Irish hymns which illustrate the thoughts and feelings of the people in reference to the prerogative of St. Peter and his illustrious successors; we still possess many old archives in Ireland holding canonical enactments of the early Irish Church, regarding the authority of the Roman See; there are records of numerous pilgrimages undertaken by Irish saints, in the spirit of filial attachment, to the chair of the Vicar of Christ.

But these evidences we must leave aside for the present, in order to meet other arguments of recent date by which an attempt is made to show that "Popery" is a comparatively late importation into Ireland. Wilde in his "Boyne and Blackwater" maintains that Ireland first fell under the sway of Rome at the Council

of Cashel in the days of Henry the Second; and Dean Murray, of Ardagh, in his "Ireland and her Church" credits Gerald Barry with being one of the first to introduce "Romanism" into Ireland. This "Anglo-Norman theory" has been asserted so confidently, and repeated so often, that it has gained some credit.

It is acknowledged from clear and existing records that long before Irish soil echoed to the martial tread of Strongbow and his steel-clad Norman knights, there were *Papal Legates* in the country. Thus we find Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, appointed in 1110; Malachy, Bishop of Down, appointed in 1140, and Christian, Bishop of Lismore, appointed in 1151. History tells us how these prelates, in their capacity as Papal Legates, enjoyed supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the Irish Church. They exercised disciplinary authority throughout the country, they presided at Synods, they took precedence of all dignitaries, even of the Archbishop of Armagh. Surely these facts are irreconcilable with Ireland's rejection of Papal supremacy previous to the Norman invasion. But we have a still more striking instance of the exercise of Papal authority. The famous Synod of Kells was held in the year 1152, twenty years before the Invasion; and it was presided over by Cardinal Paparo, a Papal Legate, sent direct from the Eternal City. The records of this Synod state that the four Irish Archbishops received from the hands of the Cardinal Legate the *Pallium*, which was the distinctive badge of obedience to the Roman See. Need I go any further to prove that the recognition of Papal supremacy in the Irish Church was not due to the Anglo-Norman invasion?

It may be objected that if the Anglo-Normans were not literally the first to bring the Irish Church under the sway of the Roman Pontiff, that event is still largely attributable to them, inasmuch as their rulers actually put on a lasting basis the uncertain authority which Papal ambition and Papal intrigue had a short time previously established.

But then, I ask, who may assert that the Papal authority was uncertain before the Norman invasion? There exists a rather famous Bull of Adrian IV. I do not here forget that there is or was tedious controversy regarding its authenticity. For even if that Bull were a forgery (which I do not admit), it would still

bear witness to the fact that when King Henry felt the power of the Irish chieftains becoming too strong for him, he sought to overcome their opposition by arming his representatives in Ireland with this Bull (true or alleged) of Adrian IV, wherein the Pope is represented as handing over the Islands to Henry, and entrusting to him the Reformation of the Irish Church. The King's act would have had little meaning, if it did not imply that Ireland was already a most obedient and faithful daughter of the Apostolic See.

But why multiply arguments? Were the Norman Kings of England so loyal to the Pope as to show themselves really willing to extend his spiritual rule? Was not the reign of Henry himself one long struggle against the rights of the Church and the Holy See, culminating in the murder of St. Thomas à Becket in his own Cathedral, for his intrepid and unflinching defence of those rights against the tyrant's encroachments? Must not the same be said of King John, who struggled againt the prerogatives of the Church down to the closing years of his reign; when he was at length forced to come to his knees, and own himself the vassal of the Roman Pontiff? Pretty apostles these, forsooth, of "Romanism" in Ireland!

Even if the Norman rulers had been as loyal to the Holy See as Charlemagne or Louis IX, it may be safely asserted that they would have been quite incapable of changing the religious convictions of the Irish people from the Protestantism which is claimed for them to an enthusiastic obedience and love for the Roman See. There existed, as is well known, then and for centuries after, an implacable animosity towards the foreign Sassenach and the native "Irish enemies"; and if England during the last three hundred years, with unlimited power in Ireland, has been incapable of forcing Protestantism on the people, we might fairly suppose that she was unable during the Norman times to force Papal supremacy on them.

The year 1152 is often quoted as the date of the rise of the Papal authority in Ireland. Dr. Mant, Bishop of Down and Connor, in his work "The Church of Ireland," roundly asserts, that the Synod of Kells held in that year is the first instance of Papal usurpation to be found in the history of the Irish Church.

According to him, the Archbishop of Armagh enjoyed up to that date supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Ireland, appointing to bishoprics, presiding at Synods, and recognizing no superior on earth. He arraigns St. Malachy, who, he says, was ambitious to have the Pallium, for having brought the independent Irish Church under the Papal yoke; and the learned critic of Irish history is quite exercised at "the fatal collation of the Archiepiscopal Palls" in 1152.

It is singular enough that, if Dr. Mant be correct, there should never have been uttered a word of protest by the independent Irish bishops, against this unwarranted usurpation of St. Malachy and the Roman See. We know that they strenuously exerted themselves, only a century earlier, to resist the encroachments of Canterbury. Are we then to believe that they were ready to bow at this time their necks, without a struggle, to a strange yoke? Are we to suppose that the Archbishop of Armagh, the hitherto independent head of the Irish Church, as our opponents suppose him to have been, wanted a master, or that it was possible to deliver over the Irish hierarchy, without the trace of a struggle, as subjects to a Roman Bishop whom they had never before recognized as superior to themselves? The supposition is on the face of it absurd. Dr. Mant is misled by the apparent fact that previous to the year 1152, the Pope had never had cause to interfere in the appointment of Irish Bishops, and that up to that date the Irish Bishops had not received the Pallium. But this is no argument for the historian.

If it be true that there are but few traces to be found in the annals of Irish Church history, to show that the Pope interfered in the government of Ireland before St. Malachy's time, there are abundant reasons to account for the fact. In the first place, the distance of Ireland from Rome necessarily limited the communication between the two countries. There were no steamships, railways, postal or telegraph systems available. The route lay between half-civilized countries, often at war, and travel was beset with difficulties. Under such circumstances it must seem quite natural that St. Celestine should have invested St. Patrick with plenary powers in matters pertaining to the appointing of bishops and abbots, the convocation of synods, the passing of disciplinary

enactments for the government of the local churches. It is a rather good testimony to the fidelity of the people, and also to the efficiency of their bishops and priests, that there should have been no occasion which obliged them to have unnecessary recourse to Rome.

But there are other arguments which, however briefly summed up, I must defer to another instalment of this survey of the position which the Irish Church has from its very beginning held toward the Mother Church of Rome.

(To be continued.)

JAMES J. MCNAMEE.

St. Macarthen's Seminary,
Monaghan, Ireland.

CARENTIA OVARIORUM VEL UTERI NUM OBSTET MULIERIS MATRIMONIO.

IN fasciculis mensis Dec. anni praeterlapsi et hujus anni mensis Januar. disputatum est de impedimento impotentiae matrimonium dirimenti, quo late se extendat ad defectus ex parte feminae exsistentes: utrum scilicet carentia ovariorum impedimentum matrimonii dirimens constituat, an habenda sit pro sola sterilitate quae valorem matrimonii non afficiat.

Hac in re, ut fasciculi quos dixi demonstrant, nova exorta est controversia, allis affirmantibus exsistere impedimentum dirimens, negantibus aliis. Cujus controversiae occasionem imprimis dedit libellus Romae conscriptus et editus, cui titulus "Jos. Antonelli, sac. *De conceptu impotentiae et sterilitatis relate ad matrimonium.*" Auctor enim omnino tenet, illam carentiam vere constituere impotentiam neque ab ejusmodi femina quae defectu isto laboret, matrimonium valide iniri posse. Contra quam sententiam imprimis cl. Eschbach, rector Seminarii Gallici in Urbe, in libellis periodicis qui inscribuntur *Analecta Ecclesiastica* opposuit sententiam, quae in ejusmodi defectu non impotentiam sed sterilitatem tantum agnovit.[1]

Neque illa controversia restringitur ad defectum nativum, sed

[1] *Anal. Eccl.*, X, pp. 85, 135, 225, 313, 466, 494, sqq.

comprehendit etiam defectum arte inductum, videlicet de iis feminis etiam agit, quae excisionem ovariorum per manus chirurgi subierunt; neque de solis ovariis deficientibus vel excisis agit, sed etiam de *utero* deficiente vel *exciso.*

Difficultas in hac quaestione solvenda imprimis est theoretica: quam libellus ille ab Antonelli conscriptus pertractat. Verum accedit difficultas practica, quid videlicet permittendum, quid interdicendum sit iis feminis quae defectu isto laborent. Neque res adeo rara tangitur; nam satis frequentes nostra aetate sunt mulieres, quae istam excisionem sive uteri, sive ovariorum, sive excisionem utramque variis ex causis subierint. Dicam pauca (1) de theoretica difficultate, (2) de difficultate practica.

I.

Quoad priorem difficultatem *urgens* ratio, cur illa ovariorum et uteri carentia videatur constituere impotentiam atque impedimentum matrimonii dirimens, ea est quod per eam essentialis matrimonii finis evadat impossibilis.

Nimirum: Matrimonium institutum est ad conservationem et propagationem generis humani seu filiorum generationem. Et quamquam ipsa filiorum generatio non est necessaria et essentialis, videtur tamen plane ad essentiam matrimonii pertinere, ut mutuum jus tradatur ad actus generandae proli aptos. At in carentia ovariorum vel uteri actus generandae proli apti sunt prorsus impossibiles: deest enim elementum necessarium a muliere subministrandum, vel ovum humanum, vel via qua ovum reddi possit fecundum. Ad impossibilia autem jus dare vel dare velle absurdum est. Ergo *essentia* matrimonii videtur deficere, ac proin exsistere impedimentum matrimonii dirimens.

Accedit explicatio *S. Alphonsi*, qui ex communi auctorum sententia discrimen inter sterilitatem et impotentiam sic explicat lib. 6, n. 1096: "Impotentia est illa propter quam conjuges non possunt copulam habere per se aptam ad generationem; unde sicut validum est matrimonium inter eos qui possunt copulari, esto *per accidens* nequeant generare, puta quia steriles aut senes, vel quia femina semen non retinet, ita nullum est matrimonium inter eos qui nequeant consumare eo actu, quo ex se esset possibilis generatio." Et quamquam S. D. haec l. c. applicat ad defec-

tum viri, tamen eadem videtur esse ratio, quando propter defectum feminae actus, *ex quo ex se generatio possibilis sit*, haberi nequit.

Nihilominus ipsa S. Doctoris verba in se continent, quod contra hoc argumentum possit opponi. Validum matrimonium eorum dicit, qui sunt steriles vel senes. At revera continua et constans est praxis Ecclesiae, a primordiis servata, ut benedicat etiam matrimonia eorum, qui in senili aetate volunt contrahere, eaque matrimonia pro validis habeat, si modo vir et femina inter se copulari possint. Verum, si feminam senilis aetatis respicimus (nam de viro loqui necesse non est), a vetula praestari ea amplius non possunt, quae ad generandam prolem essentialiter pertinent. Ovaria ejus, utpote exsiccata, officio fungi nullatenus possunt, neque ovulum amplius maturare et dimittere valent; ergo deest primarium elementum ad generandam prolem necessarium. Hinc ejus conditio plane eadem est atque illius feminae quae ovariis caret.

Dicunt quidem aetatem, in qua femina ita deficiat, non posse exacte definiri, neque deesse exempla earum, quae in summa aetate etiam prolem genuerint. At licet non accurate eadem aetas quascumque feminas reddat steriles, est tamen aetas ultra quam communiter vis generandi non perduret; et si rarissimae exceptiones fuerint, hae, maxime si agatur de matrimonio *contrahendo*, probari deberent, si vis generandi deberet mansisse intacta, ut matrimonium ineundum valeret. Ecclesia autem nunquam erat sollicita in tali probatione exigenda, sed etiam in iis casibus, in quibus vel praesumptio vel ipsa certitudo exstinctae generandi facultatis adest, senum matrimonia semper permisit.

Unde qui vim generandi in muliere deficientem non agnoscunt pro impotentia, sed pro sterilitate matrimonii valorem non derimente, essentiam matrimonii ejusque finem essentialem aliter debent definire. Dicunt igitur, finem quidem primarium esse filiorum generationem, attamen secundarium finem eumque ad essentiam matrimonii sufficientem esse, ut sit remedium concupiscentiae. Quapropter matrimonium consistere posse validum, si modo copula complete haberi possit, quae apta sit ad completam satisfactionem utrique praestandam; hanc quidem ex se ex ordinarie contingentibus etiam aptam esse ad generandam prolem, at si propter defectum accidentalem ille finis generandae prolis non attingatur

neque possit attingi, propterea tamen matrimonium non exsistere nullum.

Quae si vera sint, jam patet eos qui defendunt carentiam ovariorum non constituere impotentiam matrimonii dirimentem, posse cum fundamento non levi insistere in similitudine cum matrimonio senum. Et si semel admittitur, vim generandi ad valorem matrimonii in femina non esse necessariam, facile est gressum facere ad casum de carentia uteri: videlicet neque hunc defectum, quum non impediat copulam perfectam ex parte viri neque satisfactionem mulieris, esse impedimentum matrimonii dirimens.

Ex iis igitur, quae dicta sunt, concludi poterit: de sententia, quae mulierem ovariis et utero per excisionem orbatam matrimonii contrahendi inhabilem habeat, jam conclamatum esse. Verum qui ita ex analogia cum matrimonio senum concluderet, praepropere ageret. Nam res in eo differunt, ut quando sermo est de excisione ovariorum vel uteri, aliquid *positive actum sit* contra primarium matrimonii finem; quando de matrimonio senum, *nihil actum sit* contra hunc finem sed naturali conditioni humanae omnia relinquantur. Quantopere autem alterum ab altero differat relate ad matrimonii nullitatem efficiendam vel non efficiendam, patet ex effectu conditionum in pactum matrimoniale inductarum: quae si positive aliquid agendum statuant contra primarium matrimonii finem, matrimonium reddant nullum, alias illud per se relinquant validum.

Quare puto, quaestionem propositam, utrum excisio ovariorum vel uteri constituat impedimentum dirimens necne, theoretice nondum esse plane solutam. Verum estne quaestio haec practice soluta?

II.

Practicam solutionem videmur accipere posse ex responsis S. Officii, quae tum die 3 Februarii 1887 tum postea die 30 Julii 1890 data sunt. Praestat haec denuo oculis subjicere. Ut *Analecta Eccl.*, X, p. 497 referunt responsa sunt haec:

1. Sub die 3 Februarii 1887 ad QUAESITUM: "Num mulier, per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum sterilis effecta, ad matrimonium ineundum permitti *valeat* et *liceat*, necne?" S. OFFICIUM R. "Re mature diuque perpensa, matrimonium mulieris, de qua in casu, non esse impediendum."

2. Die 30 Julii 1890. S. OFFICIUM sequentes litteras dedit ad Ep. Regiensem:

"*Illme ac Rme Domine:—*

"In Congregatione feria iv diei 23 currentis mensis discussum est dubium ab Amplitudine Tua propositum supplici libello diei Octobris elapsi anni, videlicet:

"Num mulier *N. N.* cui operatione chirurgica ablata sunt duo ovaria et uterus admitti possit ad matrimonium contrahendum? Et re mature perpensa, Emi. DD. Cardinales una mecum Inquisitores Generales decreverunt: *Matrimonium non esse impediendum.*

"Quod cum Amplitudini Tuae pro istius Curiae norma significo, Eidem fausta quaeque adprecor a Domino.

"Amplitudinis Tuae
addictissimus in Domino
"R. *Card.* MONACO."

Romae, die 30 Julii 1890.

Quorum responsorum vis et efficacia perpendenda est, ut cognoscamus, quid pro solutione quaestionis nostrae generali inde deduci possit, quid non possit.

Excederet utique in aestimanda vi et efficacia horum responsorum, qui concluderet, rem esse plene absolutam atque irrevocabiliter definitam. Nam ut ipsius S. Officii decretis illam vim attribuere possimus, necesse est, ut sint vere decreta doctrinalia omnes Christifideles spectantia, et ut sint a R. Pontifice confirmata, idque non in forma communi sed in forma specifica. Quorum nihil obtinet in nostra re. Decreta quae attulimus, sunt decisiones *particulares* in singularibus causis datae, neque per se vel directe doctrinales sunt, neque prae se ferunt approbationem R. Pontificis, multo minus ejus approbationem specialem.

Operae pretium est referre, quod *Wernz*, Jus Decretal. t. ii, n. 659, ad eam rem scribit: "Sententiae judiciales etiam hujus supremae Congregationis [scil. S. Officii] jus tantum constituunt inter partes nec vim legum universalium habent. Decreta, quae de doctrina catholica fidei vel morum a S. C. Inquis. publicantur, etiamsi a R. Pontifice in forma *communi* fuerint confirmata, magnam sane habent auctoritatem, sed ex sese irreformabilia non sunt, nisi a R. Pontifice per confirmationem in forma *specifica*

datum in veras definitiones *R. Pontificis* ex cathedra loquentis transmutentur. Utrum decreta vel instructiones S. C. Inq. vim legum universalium habeant, an ordinationes tantum particulares contineant, ex ipso tenore verborum, inscriptione, forma approbationis et promulgationis est eruendum."

Si haec applicamus ad decreta supra allata, evidens est, eas non esse leges universales, multo minus irreformabiles, sed esse decisiones et injunctiones particulares quamquam nituntur in aliqua legis naturalis vel divinae interpretatione.

A vero igitur aberrant, mea sententia, illi, qui decreta S. Officii supra allata habeant pro suprema legis naturalis vel divinae interpretatione doctrinali, quae ab omnibus qui eam noverint pro norma haberi *debeat. Debebant* decisionem pro norma habere Curiae illae episcopales, ad quas decisio data est, idque in iis causis quae erant ad S. Officium delatae.

At altera quaestio est, num *possint* decisiones illae pro norma haberi *ubique*.

Wernz alio loco, vid. t. i, n. 196, non apprime quidem ad rem nostram, tamen in re simili dicit: "Decreta particularia SS. CC., quae interpretationem juris communis dubii et obscuri . . . continent, sane magnam habent auctoritatem et non solum ut interpretationes doctrinales, sed etiam tamquam vere authenticae personas obligant, quibus data sunt; attamen supremum gradum auctoritatis, *i. e.*, legum universalium non attingunt, nisi universae Ecclesiae legitime promulgentur aut iteratis declarationibus transeant in stylum Curiae aut in praxim et disciplinam communiter vigentem."

Ut pressius loquar de nostris decretis, S. Officium sane *censebat*, excisionem ovariorum et uteri non obstare liceitati ineundi matrimonii; nisi enim id censuisset, non potuisset in casu particulari mulieri licentiam dare. Ejusmodi *practicum* judicium de liceitate rei quae conceditur, non supponit necessario veritatem rei ejusque certitudinem, neque hanc adesse S. Officium suis decretis declaravit. Summum aliquis dicere poterit, Cardinalibus qui S. Officii munus gerebant, *persuasum fuisse* de rei veritate, scil. quod carentia ovariorum et uteri impedimentum matrimonii dirimens non constituat. Sed haec persuasio etsi adfuerit, quum in infallibilitate non nitatur, errori *potest* esse obnoxia.

Verum necesse non est, ut Cardinales *cum certitudine* judicarent abesse impedimentum dirimens. Sufficit, ut judicaverint id esse *satis probabile*. Nam si satis probabile est, impedimentum dirimens non exsistere, non constat, a muliere fieri rem lege divina et naturali prohibitam, si matrimonium ineat eoque utatur; quod si non constat, licebit ei matrimonium inire. Gravissimi theologi in ipsis supremis R. Pontificis decisionibus, quae non doctrinam aliquam definiant, docent, posse Romanum Pontificem secundum probabilis juris sui interpretationem procedere: multo magis teneri debet, sufficere probabilem interpretationem juris seu legis, ut S. Officio liceat responsum et decisionem particularem dare.

Id unum igitur ex decretis S. Officii allatis *certo* concludi potest, S. Officium habuisse pro probabili legis divinae et naturalis interpretatione, excisionem ovariorum et uteri in muliere non constituere impedimentum matrimonii dirimens. Hoc autem *sufficit*, ut inde securam sumere possimus normam practicam. Si enim S. Officium id habuit pro probabili, quis dixerit, id *non esse probabile*. Certe S. Officium, ut ipsum testatur, rem mature discussit. Quando autem doctissimi viri rem adeo mature consideraverunt, temerarium esset dicere, non adesse rationes internas graves quae suadeant id quod illi demum concluserunt. Immo sola hujus supremi tribunalis auctoritas tanta est, ut necesse non sit in rationes inquirere, sed ut ex mera auctoritate exsistat sententia probabilis et practice tuta.

Utut igitur liceat, theoretice contrariam opinionem defendere, atque accitis rationibus conatum in id dirigere, ut S. Offici sententia in posterum feratur contraria: quamdiu id factum non fuerit, cuilibet, cujus interest, licebit sequi opinionem, quam S. Officium in suis decisionibus judicabat esse sive veram sive practice probabilem; neque quempiam, qui eam opinionem sequi velit, licebit mea sententia impedire.

Ergo, ut breviter dicam, decreta S. Officii id effecerunt, ut mulier, cui excisa sunt ovaria et uterus, ab ineundo matrimonio impediri non possit, nisi Roma sententiam contrariam edixerit.

Quae conclusio practica ut magis eluceat, ad eas difficultates etiam respondendum est, quae a rigidioris opinionis patronis possunt moveri. Tota haec difficultas in eo sita est, quod S. Officium rationes sui responsi dare non soleat nec dederit, rationes

autem esse possint pro singularibus istis causis propositis *peculiares*, quae non subsint communiter: quod si ita sit, decisio illa particularis sumitur perperam pro norma generali seu communi. Et revera contendunt non solum severioris opinionis sectatores, sed etiam alii ex alio fine, non constare casus propositos egisse de excisione *totali;* verum nisi hoc sit, vim generandi in muliere re ipsa non esse plene sublatam, sufficere enim reliquias ovarii, ut demum sequi possit conceptio prolis, sufficere etiam relictam esse uteri partem, ut conceptio saltem ectopica non evaserit impossibilis. Quum igitur hae fuerint fortasse conditiones mulierum, de quibus egerit sententia S. Officii, nihil sequi videri poterit pro liceitate et valore matrimonii ejus mulieris, quae *totalem* excisionem passa sit.

Attamen, ut his difficultatibus respondeam, concedo quidem, Sacras Congregationes Romanas non reddere responsi sui rationes; sed noto, ea nihilominus vera esse debere quae in ipsis responsis edicuntur. In responso autem priore die 3 Febr. 1887 expresse agitur de muliere, quae per utriusque ovarii excisionem *sterilis sit effecta;* clarum igitur est, S. Officium respicere eum casum, in quo generatio propter excisionem evaserit impossibilis.

In posteriore casu sermo est de muliere, cui ovaria *et uterus sint oblata.* Quod nemo dixerit de operatione, quae partem tantum uteri abscindat. Sed si uterus vel maxima ejus pars exciditur, etsi ovaria manserint intacta (quod saepissime non ita est: nam saepe cum utero simul extirpantur ovaria), tamen communicatio ovarii cum utero occluditur, atque hac ratione ovi fecundatio prolisque conceptio redditur impossibilis. Quare etiam in hoc posteriore S. Officii responso Emi Cardinales ex eo profecti sunt, quod habuerint mulierem generandi vi omnino destitutam. Ergo re vera S. Officii responsa pro communi norma sumi possunt in casibus similibus.

Id vero certum est, talem mulierem, si matrimonium inire vult, debere virum cui nubere velit conditionem suam docere; alioquin in re gravissima ille decipitur, eo quod a spe posteritatis plane dejiciatur.

Postremo tangi debet difficultas practica. Si enim responsa S. Officii in re nostra pro norma generali sumuntur, videntur multorum peccatorum praeberi ansa et incitamentum. Multae mulieres conceptionem prolis abhorrent. Si igitur post ablatam generandi

vim nihilominus matrimonium inire possint, tentationem incurrunt (eique non raro cessurae sunt) istam operationem subeundi, eo fine, ne in matrimonio matres fiant.

Cui difficultati respondeo: (1) Abusus in plerisque rebus et juribus non est impossibilis factus; per hanc possibilitatem res ipsae vel jura non mutantur. (2) S. Officium quidem non loquitur de muliere, quae volens ex inhonesto fine incisionem subiit. Attamen ex quacumque causa demum defectus ille inductus fuerit, mulieris conditio circa aptitudinem ad matrimonium *eadem* est. Quapropter sive ex necessitate curandi morbi sive ex libero fine malo chirurgica ista operatio facta fuerit: censeo non constare de impedimento matrimonii dirimenti. Peccat gravissime femina, quae ex mero arbitrio vel ex intentione fruendi matrimonio sine onere ex maternitate oriundo operationem faciendam curat, peccat medicus, qui vel rogatus tali intentioni obsecundat, quum sola necessitas salvandae vitae vel gravis curandi morbi ratio esse possit, ex qua liceat istam mutilationem sive subire sive facere: verum postquam facta fuerit, lege naturali matrimonium non prohibetur, eo quod impedimentum dirimens non exsistat vel saltem de eo non constet. (3) Ecclesia utique potestate potitur statuendi impedimenti. Si igitur opportunum judicaverit, statuere poterit, ut vel omnis operatio chirurgica, qua mulieris ovaria vel uterus excidantur, vel ejusmodi operatio temere facta subsequens matrimonium dirimat. Quod si fecerit, res erit confecta. Sed quamdiu hoc non fecerit, aliis jus non erit matrimonium mulieris per excisionem ovariorum vel uteri sterilis effectae impedire.

AUG. LEHMKUHL, S.J.

Valkenbergi Hollandiae
in Collegio S. Ignatii.

Analecta.

ENCYCLICAL LETTER

Of Our Holy Father

LEO XIII

To the Bishops of Italy.

Venerable Brethren: Health and Apostolic Benediction:

Fixing Our mind on the serious condition of society, We have not been slow to recognize, from the very beginning of Our Pontificate, that one of the gravest duties of Our Apostolic charge was to watch in a most special manner over the formation of the clergy. We understood, in effect, that every project of Ours to restore the Christian spirit amongst the people would be vain, unless the ecclesiastical body preserved entire and vigorous the priestly spirit. Hence, We have not ceased to provide therefore according to Our power, as well by suitable institutions as by many documents, all tending to the same end.

At the present moment, Venerable Brethren, a special solicitude for the clergy of Italy induces Us to touch once more upon a subject of such great importance. It is true, indeed, that the clergy afford

splendid and constant proofs of learning, piety and zeal, amongst which it pleases us to recall with praise their ardor to coöperate with the bishops in the direction of the Catholic movement, which is so dear to Us.

We cannot, however, hide the anxiety which we feel at seeing insinuating itself here and there, for some time past, a spirit of ill considered innovation, concerning, not only the formation, but also the manifold action of the ministers of religion. It is even now easy to foresee what serious consequences we should have to deplore, if to such novel tendencies a suitable remedy were not applied. In order to preserve the Italian clergy from the pernicious influences of the times, We consider it opportune, Venerable Brethren, to recall in Our present Letter the true and changeless principles which should regulate ecclesiastical education and the sacred ministry.

Divine in its origin, supernatural in its being, immutable in character, the Catholic priesthood is not an institution which may be accommodated to the inconstancy of opinions and the systems of men. A sharing of the Eternal Priesthood of Jesus Christ, it must perpetuate, even unto the consummation of ages, the same mission which the Divine Father confided to His Incarnate Son: "As the Father sent Me, so I send you."[1] To effect the eternal salvation of souls is the great mandate which it may never fail to obey; just as, in order to accomplish this faithfully, it must never cease to have recourse to those remedies, those Divine rules of thought and action, which Jesus Christ gave when He sent His Apostles through the entire world, to convert the nations to the Gospel. Hence it is that St. Paul repeats, in his Epistles, that the priest is not other than the *ambassador*, the *minister of Christ*, the *dispenser of His mysteries;*[2] and represents him as raised to the position of intermediary between heaven and earth,[3] to treat with God concerning the supreme interests of the human race, which are those of the life eternal. Such is the conception which the Sacred Books exhibit of the Christian priesthood; a supernatural institution, superior to all others on earth, and entirely separated from them as the Divine is from the human.

The same lofty ideal stands out clearly from the writings of the Fathers, the teaching of the Roman Pontiffs and the Bishops, the decrees of Councils, the unanimous conviction of the Doctors and

[1] St. John 20: 21.
[2] II Cor. 5: 20; 6: 4; I Cor. 4: 1.
[3] Hebrew 5: 1.

Catholic Schoolmen. Nay, the unbroken tradition of the Church proclaims with one voice, that the priest is *another Christ*, and that the priesthood, *although exercised on earth, appertains in truth to the celestial hierarchy;*[4] *because to him is entrusted the administration of things altogether heavenly, and a power is conferred upon him which God has not conferred even upon the angels*[5]—a power and a ministry which regard the government of souls, or *the art of arts.*[6] Therefore have the education, the studies, the moral formation, in a word, all that appertains to ecclesiastical discipline, been ever considered as something consistent and complete in itself, not only distinct, but entirely separated from the ordinary standards of the life of laymen.

This distinction and separation must, then, remain in our day, and all tendencies to blend or confound ecclessiastical education and manner of life with the education and life of the laity are condemned, not only by the tradition of our Christian past, but by Apostolic teaching and the commandments of Jesus Christ.

Undoubtedly, in the formation of the clergy and in the priestly ministry, reason insists that we take into account the diversity of times. In consequence, We are far from disapproving of those changes which render the work of the clergy more efficacious amidst the society in which they live. It is precisely for this reason that We have deemed it fitting to foster amongst ecclesiastics a culture more solid and more perfect, and to open for this ministry a more extended field; but every other innovation that would cause injury to the essential character of the priesthood must be considered altogether blameworthy. Above all things, the priest is constituted the teacher, physician and shepherd of souls, and guides them to an end which is beyond the limits of the present life. He can never correspond fully with functions so noble, unless he be versed as deeply as he should be in the science of things holy and Divine, unless he be abundantly endowed with that piety which makes him a man of God, unless he employ all his efforts to confirm his teaching by the power of example, according to the warning given to the spiritual pastors by the Prince of the Apostles: "Being made a pattern of the flock from the heart."[7] Whatever changes the times and the conditions of society undergo, those are the proper and supreme qualities which, according

[4] S. J. Chrysos., *De Sacerd.*, Lib. III, n. 4.

[5] *Ib.*, n. 5.

[6] S. Greg. M., *Reg. Past.*, Par. i, C. 1.

[7] I Peter 5: 3.

to the principles of faith, should be resplendent in the Catholic priest. All other endowments, natural and human, are commendable, it is true; but, in relation with the priestly office, they will have an importance only secondary and relative. If, then, it is reasonable and just, that, within lawful limits, the clergy should accommodate themselves to the needs of the present age, it is, similarly, just and necessary, that, far from yielding to the dangerous current of the time, they should resist it with vigor. This conduct corresponds with the lofty purpose of the priesthood, and, by increase of dignity and respect, renders its ministry more fruitful. It is only too well known how the spirit of naturalism tends to corrupt the social body, even in the healthiest places; the spirit which puffs up the souls of men and prompts them to revolt against all authority; which degrades human hearts and turns them to seek things which decay, oblivious of those which endure forever. It is much to be feared that the influence of this spirit, so injurious and already so far diffused, may insinuate itself amongst ecclesiastics, especially those of less experience. Its disastrous consequences would be the lessening of that gravity of conduct which the priest so greatly needs, easy concessions to the charm of every novelty, pretentious indocility towards superiors, neglect of that gravity and moderation in discussion which are so necessary, particularly in matters of faith and morals. But an effect far more deplorable, because linked with prejudice to the Christian world, would ensue in the sacred ministry of the word, into which would be introduced a language incompatible with the character of the herald of the Gospel.

Moved by such considerations We feel obliged to recommend anew and with greater earnestness, that, above all things, the seminaries be maintained, with zealous solicitude, in their proper spirit, as well in what concerns the education of the mind as in what concerns that of the heart. It must never be forgotten that their exclusive purpose is to prepare young men, not for human functions, howsoever legitimate and honorable they may be, but for the exalted mission which We have indicated, of *ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God.*[8] According to this ideal, altogether supernatural, it will be ever easy, as We have remarked in the Encyclical to the clergy of France in September, 1899, to trace the precious standards, not only for the true formation of clerics, but also for the averting

[8] 1 Cor. 4: 1.

from educational establishments all peril in the way of religion or morality.

As to studies, since the clergy may not ignore the progress made in any branch of useful knowledge, let them accept whatever is recognized as sound and helpful in the new methods ; for each epoch contributes something to the growth of human thought. We wish, however, that in this regard the directions be carefully recalled which We have given concerning the study of classical literature, and especially the study of philosophy, theology, and the analogous sciences ; directions which We have set forth in several documents, but particularly in the Encyclical of which We transmit you a copy with this Our present Letter.

It is certainly desirable that all young ecclesiastics may always be able, as they should be, to make their course of studies in the shelter of sacred institutions. But since grave reasons counsel that at times some of them should frequent the public universities, let it not be forgotten with what and how great precautions the bishops should allow them to do so.[9]

For the sublime object of preparing worthy ministers of God it is necessary, Venerable Brethren, to employ with an ever increasing vigor and vigilance, besides scientific methods, the disciplinary and educational organization of your seminaries. Let only those young men be admitted who offer solid hopes of a purpose to consecrate themselves forever to the ecclesiastical ministry. Let them avoid contact and community of abode with young men who do not aspire to the priesthood. This manner of living in community with them may be tolerated for a time for just and grave reasons and with special precautions, as long as young ecclesiastics cannot be recruited according to the spirit of their proper training. Let those be sent away who during the course of their studies manifest tendencies little in accordance with the priestly calling; and in admitting clerics to sacred orders let the greatest care be employed according to the weighty warning of St. Paul to Timothy, "Impose not hands lightly upon any man."

In all this it is fitting that every other consideration be esteemed as secondary ; every other must be deemed inferior to the most important of all considerations, that of the dignity of the sacred ministry.

Then, in order to form in the students of the sanctuary a living

[9] Instr. *Perspectum*, S. Congr. EE. RR. 21 July, 1896.

image of Jesus Christ, it is a matter of great consequence for that formation which is the crown of all ecclesiastical education, that the directors and teachers join to diligence and the experience of their functions the example of a truly sacerdotal life. The exemplary conduct of those who exercise authority, especially over young men, is the most eloquent language and the most persuasive to inspire them with the sense of their own obligations and the love of good. A work so important demands, especially of the spiritual director, a prudence far beyond the ordinary, and a never-wearied care; and such a function as his and of which We wish to see no seminary deprived, calls for an ecclesiastic greatly experienced in the ways of Christian perfection. We cannot recommend him urgently enough to spread and cultivate amongst the students, in the most lasting manner, piety, profitable for all, but of inestimable value for the clergy. Let him also forearm them against the dangerous mistake, common enough amongst the young, when they allow themselves to be carried away by the ardor of study, to the point of neglecting, in consequence, their progress in the science of the Saints. The more deeply piety sinks its roots in the souls of ecclesiastics, the more capable will they be of that powerful spirit of sacrifice, absolutely necessary to labor for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

Thank God, there are not wanting in the Italian clergy priests who give noble proofs of what is possible to a minister of God penetrated with this spirit. Admirable is the generosity of a great number, who, to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, run with ardor to distant lands, regardless of fatigue, privations, and sufferings of all kinds, and even of martyrdom.

Thus, surrounded by tender and vigilant care, in a fitting culture of spirit and talent, the young levite will gradually become such as the holiness of his calling and the needs of the Christian people require. The apprenticeship is long indeed; it must be continued even beyond the days of the seminary. In effect, young priests may not be left without guides in their first labors; they have need to be sustained by the experience of men more capable, whose zeal, and piety, and prudence, have grown mature. It is similarly useful to form the custom of keeping them continually in touch with sacred studies, either by academic exercises or by conferences at fixed intervals.

It is evident, Venerable Brethren, that the recommendations which We have hitherto made, far from being a hindrance in any way, are, on the contrary, most useful for that social activity of the clergy which

We have so often encourged as a need of our times. As a faithful observance of the rules which We have recalled require, it is necessary to safeguard that which must be the life and soul of this activity. Let Us repeat it again and more emphatically: it is necessary that the clergy go to the Christian people, who are exposed on every side to snares and false promises, and urged, especially by socialism, to apostasy from their hereditary faith. But all priests must subordinate their action to *those whom the Holy Ghost has placed as Bishops to rule the Church of God*, without which confusion and grave disorder would ensue to the prejudice of the cause which they have to defend and promote. We desire, furthermore, in pursuance of this purpose, that at the end of their seminary course the aspirants to the priesthood shall receive instruction in the Pontifical documents which concern the social question and Christian democracy, while abstaining, however, as We have said above, from outward work. Then, having become priests, let them sedulously labor for the people, who are always the object of the most affectionate solicitude of the Church. To save the children of the people from ignorance of spiritual and eternal things, and with industrious tenderness to guide them towards an honorable and virtuous life; to confirm the adults in the faith, and, while dissipating contrary prejudices, to urge them to the observance of the Christian life; to promote amongst the Catholic laity those institutions which have been recognized as truly beneficial for the moral and material betterment of the masses; above all, to defend the principles of Evangelical justice and charity, by which all the rights and duties of civil society are justly harmonized—this is, in its great outlines, the noble task of priestly social action. But let him always remember that in the midst of the people he must preserve entire his august character of minister of God, being set at the head of his brethren *chiefly for the sake of souls.* Every manner of working for the people at the expense of priestly dignity, and to the prejudice of ecclesiastical duty and discipline, deserves only severe reprobation.

Such, Venerable Brethren, is what the consciousness of the Apostolic charge urged Us to speak, considering the actual situation of the clergy in Italy. We have no doubt that, in a matter so grave and so important, you will unite with Our solicitude the most active and the most devoted efforts of your zeal, being inspired particularly by the luminous example of the great Archbishop, St. Charles Borromeo.

Wherefore, to ensure the effect of Our present regulations, you will be careful to make them the subject of your local conferences, and to

agree upon such practical measures as, according to the needs of each diocese, will appear opportune. The support of Our authority will not, if necessary, be lacking to your projects and deliberations.

And now, with a word which springs spontaneously from the bottom of Our paternal heart, We turn to you all, priests of Italy, recommending that each and every one exert his utmost care to correspond ever more worthily with the proper spirit of your eminent vocation. To you, ministers of God, We say with more reason than St. Paul said to the simple faithful, "I, therefore, a prisoner in the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation in which you are called."[10] May the love of the Church, our common Mother, solidify and purify the harmony of thought and action which redoubles power and renders work more fruitful. In times so hurtful to religion and society, when the clergy of all nations must unite themselves more closely for the defence of Christian faith and morality, it behooves you, well-beloved sons, united to the Apostolic See by special bonds, it behooves you to give the example to all others, and to be the first in absolute obedience to the voice and orders of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Thus will the blessings of God descend abundantly, as We implore, in order that the clergy of Italy may remain always worthy of their glorious traditions.

Meanwhile, as a pledge of Divine favors, receive the Apostolic Blessing which We now accord, with effusion of heart, to you, Venerable Brothers, and to all the clergy whose guardians you are.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter's, on the feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, December 8, 1902, in the twenty-fifth year of Our Pontificate.

LEO XIII, Pope.

PONTIFICAL LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE HIERARCHY, CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

LEO XIII.

For a Perpetual Remembrance.

The broad stretch of islands bounded by the China Sea and the Pacific Ocean which Philip II, King of Spain, called the Philip-

[10] Ephes. 4 : 1.

pines, were scarcely opened up by Ferdinand Magellan at the beginning of the sixteenth century when, with the image of the Holy Cross planted on their shores, they were consecrated to God and offered as a first fruit offering of the Catholic religion.

From that time the Roman Pontiffs, with the aid of Charles V and Philip his son, both remarkable for their zeal for spreading the faith, have thought nothing more urgent than to convert the islanders, who were idol worshippers, to the faith of Christ. With God's help, by the strenuous efforts of the members of different religious orders, this came about very favorably and in such a short time that Gregory XIII decided to appoint a Bishop for the growing Church there, and constituted Manila an Episcopal See. With this happy beginning the growth which followed in after years corresponded in every way. Owing to the united measures of our predecessors and of the Spanish kings, slavery was abolished, the inhabitants were trained in the ways of civilization by the study of arts and letters, so that the people and Church in the Philippines were deservedly distinguished by the renown of their nation and their meritorious zeal for religion. In this way, under the direction of the kings of Spain and the patronage of the Roman Pontiffs, Catholicity was maintained with due order in the Philippine Islands. But the change which the fortunes of war have wrought in civil matters there has affected religion also; for when the Spanish yoke was removed the patronage of the Spanish kings ceased, and as a result the Church attained to a larger share of liberty, ensuring for every one rights which are safe and unassailable.

To provide against the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline in this new state of affairs a plan of action and of organization had to be sought promptly and with great care. For this purpose we sent our venerable Brother Placide Louis Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans, as our Delegate Extraordinary to the Philippine Islands, who, after examining in person and putting to rights whatever would not admit of delay or postponement, was then to report to us. The duties thus imposed he has discharged faithfully in our behalf, and deserves for this reason that we should bestow on him well-merited praise. Later it happened auspiciously that the government of the United States of America undertook, by means of a special legation, to consider plans for a way of adjusting certain questions regarding Catholic interests in the Philippines. This enterprise we gladly encouraged, and by the skill and moderation of the negotiators a way has been opened for a settlement, which is to be effected on the ground itself. After hearing

the opinions of some of the Holy Roman and Eminent Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation presiding over Extraordinary Affairs, we decree and declare in this Apostolical Constitution what has seemed, after long deliberation, to be most conducive for the interests of the Church in the Philippine Islands, trusting that what we, by our supreme authority ordain, may, with the civil government righteously and favorably disposed, be zealously and piously observed.

I.—On the New Boundaries of Dioceses.

First of all, therefore, it is our intention and purpose to increase the sacred hierarchy. When the diocese of Manila had been created by Gregory XIII, as we have said, as the faithful rapidly increased in numbers, both by reason of the natives who embraced the Catholic religion and of the arrivals from Europe, Clement VIII decided to increase the number of bishops. He therefore elevated the Church in Manila to the dignity of an Archiepiscopate, making the Bishops of the three new dioceses he created, Cebú, Caceres and Neo Segovia, suffragans to it. To these was added later, in the year 1865, the Episcopal See of Jaro.

Now these dioceses are so vast that, owing to the distance by which the settlements are separated and the difficulties of travel, the bishops can scarcely visit them thoroughly without extreme labor. Wherefore it is necessary to avail ourselves of the present opportunity to reduce the diocese already established to narrower limits, and to form new ones. Hence, keeping the Archiepiscopal See of Manila, and the dioceses of Cebú, Caceres, Neo Segovia, and Jaro, we add to them and create four new dioceses: Lipa, Tuguegarao, Capiz, and Zamboanga, all, like the others, suffragans to the Manilan Metropolis. Moreover, in the Marian Islands, we create a Prefecture Apostolic, subject, without any intermediate authority, to ourselves and to our successors.

II.—The Metropolitan and His Suffragan Bishops.

The Archbishop of Manila is the one who will bear the title of "Metropolitan" in the Philippine Islands; and all the other bishops, those who fill the old as well as those who are to occupy the newly created sees, will be subject to him, as suffragans both in rank and in name. The rights and the functions of the Metropolitan are laid down by the ecclesiastical laws already extant. As we wish that these laws

be inviolably observed, so also do we wish that the bonds of holy friendship and charity between the Metropolitan and his suffragans be ever unimpaired, and grow always closer and more binding by mutual services, exchange of counsel, and especially by frequent episcopal conventions, so far as distance may permit. Concord is the mother and guardian of the greatest benefits.

III.—The Metropolitan and Suffragan Chapters.

The dignity and precedence of the Metropolitan Church require that it should be honored by a College of Canons. The Delegate Apostolic will see and determine how to obtain in future the stipend for each of the Canons, which hitherto was paid by the Spanish government. If, owing to the shrinkage of revenue, the number of Canons cannot be maintained as heretofore, let it be reduced so as to consist of ten at least, and retain those who are Canons by right of their office. The Archbishop may by his own unrestricted right confer the aforementioned dignities, the Canonry, and all the benefices which belong to the Metropolitan Church; except, indeed, those which either by common law are reserved to the Apostolic See, or are the gift of some other person, or are controlled by the conditions of the concursus. We earnestly desire to have colleges of canons formed in the other Cathedral churches also. Until such time as this can be done, the bishops are to choose for consultors some priests, secular and religious, distinguished by their piety, learning and experience in administration, as is done in other dioceses in which there is no canonical chapter. To provide for the proper dignity of the sacred ceremonies, the consultors, just mentioned, should attend the bishop when officiating. If for any reason they be prevented from so doing, the bishop will substitute others, worthy members of the clergy, both secular and religious.

IV.—Vacant Suffragan Sees.

Should it happen that any suffragan diocese, in which there is no canonical chapter, should lose its bishop, the Metropolitan will assume its administration; should there be none, the charge will fall to the nearest bishop, with the condition, however, that a vicar be chosen as soon as possible. Meanwhile the vicar-general of the deceased bishop will manage the diocese.

V.—The Secular Clergy.

Since it is proved by experience that a native clergy is most useful everywhere, the bishops must make it their care to increase the number of native priests, in such a manner, however, as to form them thoroughly in piety and character, and to make sure that they are worthy to be entrusted with ecclesiastical charges.

Let them gradually appoint to the more responsible positions those whom practical experience will prove to be more efficient. Above all things the clergy should hold to the rule that they are not to allow themselves to be mixed up in party strifes. Although it is a maxim of common law that he who fights for God should not be involved in worldly pursuits, we deem it necessary that men in holy orders in the present condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands should avoid this in a special manner. Moreover, since there is great power in harmony of sentiment for accomplishing every great useful work for the sake of religion, let all the priests, whether secular or religious, cultivate it most zealously. It is certainly proper that they who are one body of the one head, Christ, should not envy one another, but be of one will, loving one another with brotherly charity. To foster this charity and maintain a vigorous discipline the bishops are reminded how very useful it is to convene a synod occasionally as time and place may require. In this way there will easily be unity in thought and action. To keep the first fervor of the priests from cooling and to preserve and increase the virtues which are worthy of the priesthood, the practice of the spiritual exercises is most helpful. The bishops must therefore see that all who have been called to the vineyard of the Lord should at least every third year go into retreat in some suitable place to meditate on the eternal truths, to remove the stains contracted by worldly contamination and renew their ecclesiastical spirit. Effort must be made to have the study of the sacred sciences kept alive among the clergy by frequent exercise: "For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge," by which he can teach the faithful, "who shall seek the law at his mouth."[1] For this purpose there is nothing better than to have conferences frequently, both on moral and on liturgical questions. If the difficulties of travelling, or the small number of priests, or any other similar cause, prevents them from meeting for such discussions, it will be well to have those who cannot attend the conference, treat in writing the

[1] Malachy 2 : 7.

questions proposed and submit them to the bishop at the appointed time.

VI.—THE SEMINARIES.

How much the Church thinks of seminaries for the young men who are educated with a view to the priesthood, is clear from the decree of the Council of Trent, by which they were first instituted. The bishops should, therefore, make the most diligent effort to have one in each diocese, in which young candidates for the sacred warfare may be received and trained for a holy living and in the lower and higher sciences. It is advisable that the boys who are studying literature should occupy their own building, and the young men who, after finishing the humanities, are devoted to philosophy and theology should dwell in another. In both departments the students should remain until, if deserving, they shall have been ordained priests, and never be permitted, except for grave reasons, to return to their homes. The bishop will entrust the administration of the seminary to one of the clergy, whether secular or religious, who is distinguished for his prudence and experience in governing and for holiness of life. The rules laid down by us and by our Predecessors show very clearly in what way the studies are to be regulated in seminaries. Where there is no seminary, the bishop will have candidates educated in one of the seminaries of the neighboring diocese. On no account should the bishops admit to these seminaries any but the young men who are likely to give themselves to God in holy orders. Those who wish to study for the civil professions should have other schools, if it be possible, known as episcopal institutions or colleges. Above all things the bishop, following the precept of the Apostle, is not lightly to lay hands on anyone; but to raise to orders and to employ in sacred things only those who, when well tried and duly advanced in science and virtue, can be of credit and of service to a diocese. They are not to leave those who go out from the seminary entirely to themselves; but to keep them from idleness, and from abandoning the study of the sacred sciences, it is an excellent thing to have them every year for at least five years after ordination submit to an examination in dogmatic and moral theology before men of learning and authority. Since the halls of Rome, also, are open to young students from the Philippines who may wish to pursue the higher studies, it will afford us much pleasure, if the bishops send hither from time to time young men who may one day communicate to their fellow-

citizens the knowledge of religion acquired in this very centre of truth. The Holy See will do its share in the most effective way to advance the secular clergy in higher learning and better ecclesiastical training, so that in good time it may be worthy to assume the pastoral charges now administered by the regular priests.

VII.—The Religious Education of Youth and the Manila University.

It is not to the ecclesiastical seminaries only that the bishops are to devote their attention, the young laymen who go to other schools are also committed to their care and providence. It is, therefore, the duty of the consecrated bishops to make every effort that the minds of the young who are instructed in the public schools should not lack knowledge of their religion. To have it taught properly, the bishops must see and insist that the teachers are fitted for this task, and that the books in use contain no errors. Since there is question of public schools, we do not wish to proceed without a word of praise well deserved for the great Lyceum of Manila, founded by the Dominicans, and authorized by Innocent X. Since it has always been distinguished for sound doctrine and excellent teachers, for the great good it has accomplished, not only do we wish that it be treated with favor by all the bishops, but besides we take it under our own care and that of our successors. Wherefore confirming absolutely the privileges and honors granted to it by the Roman Pontiffs, Innocent X and Clement XII, we bestow upon it the title of Pontifical University, and wish that the academic degrees conferred by it, may have the same value as the degrees given by other Pontifical Universities.

VIII.—The Regulars.

Yielding to the opportunities of the new order of things in that region, the Holy Apostolic See has decided to make suitable provision for the religious men who look to a manner of life proper to their Institute, devoted entirely to the duties of the sacred ministry, for the advancement of public morality, the increase of Christianity, and peaceful social intercourse. We recommend earnestly, therefore, to the members of the Religious Orders to discharge holily the duties which they have assumed when pronouncing their vows, "giving no offence to any man." We command them to keep their rule of cloister inviolably; and wish, therefore, that all should be bound by the

decree issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, July 20, 1731, which Clement XIII, our predecessor, confirmed by Apostolic Letters *Nuper pro parte*, August 26, the same year. The rule and boundary of the cloister are those which are laid down in another decree issued with the approbation of Pius VI by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, August 24, 1780. For the rest, the religious who labor in the Philippines must remember to treat with great reverence and honor those whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God; and bound together with the secular clergy by the closest ties of concord and charity, let them hold nothing more pressing than to work hand in hand, throwing all their energy into the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ. Furthermore, to remove every element of dissension, we wish that in future in the Philippine Islands the constitution *Formandis* of Benedict XII, dated November 6, 1744, and the other, *Romanos Pontifices*, May 8, 1881, in which we decided certain points in dispute between the Bishops and Missionary Regulars in England and Scotland, be observed.

IX.—The Parishes.

The bishops will determine what parishes are to be entrusted to pastors from the Religious Orders after conferring with the superiors of these orders. Should any question arise in this matter which cannot be settled privately the case is to be referred to the Delegate Apostolic.

X.—The Missions.

To the other means by which the Church as teacher provides that faith and good morals and all that makes for the salvation of souls should suffer no harm, must be added one of the very greatest utility, the spiritual exercises commonly known as missions. It is altogether desirable, therefore, that in each province at least one house be founded as a dwelling for about eight religious men, whose one duty it will be to visit occasionally the towns and villages and better the people by pious exhortations. If this is so useful for the faithful, it is surely necessary for those who have not yet received the light of the Gospel. Wherever, therefore, uncivilized peoples are still buried in monstrous idolatry, the bishops and priests must know that they are bound to try to convert them. Let them, therefore, establish stations among them for priests who will act as their apostles, and not only

lead the idolaters to Christian practices, but also devote themselves to the instruction of the children. These stations are to be so located that in due time they may be made Prefectures or Vicariates Apostolic. To provide those who labor in them with means for support and for the propagation of the faith, we recommend that in each diocese, without interfering with the Lyons Society for the Propagation of the Faith, special congregations of men and women be formed to manage the collection of the alms of the faithful and hand over the contributions to the bishops, to be distributed entirely and equally to the missions.

XI.—Ecclesiastical Discipline.

To win the esteem of the faithful there is no better way than for the clergy to do in effect what as priests they preach. For, since, as the Council of Trent says, they are regarded as removed above worldly things to a higher plane, others lift their eyes to them for a model and imitate what they get from them. Wherefore it is highly proper that priests should so regulate all their manners that in their dress, carriage, walk, conversation, and in all things they may appear grave, moderate and altogether religious; they should avoid even lighter faults, which in them are serious, so that all their actions may inspire veneration. It is for this restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and for the full execution of this Constitution we have sent our Venerable Brother John Baptist Guidi, Archbishop of Stauropolis, as Extraordinary Delegate Apostolic to the Philippine Islands, carrying thither our Person. In him we have conferred all necessary faculties; and we have given him besides our mandate to convene and hold a provincial Synod, as soon as circumstances permit.

XII.—On Peace and Reverence for Those in Authority.

It remains for us now only to address ourselves with paternal charity to all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, and to exhort them with all the persuasion in our power to maintain union in the bonds of peace. This the duty of our Christian profession requires: "For greater is the brotherhood in Christ, than of blood; for the brotherhood of blood means only a likeness of body, but brotherhood in Christ is unanimity in heart and in soul, as it is written in Acts 4: 32, 'and the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul.'" This, too, is required for the good of religion, which is the chief

source and ground of the praiseworthy things which have distinguished the Philippine peoples in the past. This, finally, is required by a sincere love of country, which will derive nothing but loss and destruction from public disturbance. Let them reverence those who exercise authority, according to the Apostle, "for all power is from God." And although separated from us by the broad expanse of ocean, let them know that they are one in faith with the Apostolic See, which embraces them with special affection and will never abandon its charge of protecting their interests.

E S. CONGREGATIONE DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

Circa Facultatem alienandi Bona Ecclesiastica pro Institutis Religiosis votorum simplicium.

(Milwauchiensis.)

Illme et Revme Domine:

Pervenerunt ad me litterae ab Amplitudine Tua mihi datae die 14 elapsi mensis decembris, in quibus quaestiones fiunt circa facultatem alienandi bona ecclesiastica pro Institutis religiosis votorum simplicium.

Quoad primam quaestionem, utrum haec instituta sive virorum sive mulierum, sive a S. Sede approbata, sive tantum Dioecesana, indigeant, beneplacito Sedis Apostolicae pro alienatione suorum bonorum, responsio est affirmativa.

Relate vero ad alteram quaestionem, utrum Episcopi vi privilegii ipsis concessi circa alienationem bonorum Dioeceseos possint praedictis Congregationibus has alienationes permittere, responsio est, id posse Episcopis intra limites suae facultatis.

Tandem quoad imploratam sanationem pro alienationibus sine necessaria licentia bona fide peractis, Sacra Congregatio hujus modi sanationem et, si opus sit, etiam absolutionem a censuris transgressoribus concedit.

Interim Deum precor ut Te diu sospitet.

A. V. addictissimus Servus

Fr. H. M. *Card.* Gotti, *Praef.*

Aloisius Veccia, *Secret.*

Rmo ac Illo Archiepiscopo Friderico Katzer.

(*Protocollo N. 52982.*) *Roma, 15 Gennaio 1903.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I. Letter of His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII, to the Bishops of Italy, on the Priesthood.

II. Apostolical Constitution addressed to the Hierarchy and the faithful in the Philippines in relation to the changed condition of ecclesiastical matters in the islands.

III. S. Congregation of the Propaganda addresses a letter to the Archbishop of Milwaukee concerning the right of alienating Church property on the part of Religious professing simple vows.

THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE ROMAN BREVIARY.

A short time ago a report was circulated through the press that the Roman Breviary was to be revised, and that corrected revisions, principally of the historical readings, would be substituted for the present *lectiones* in the nocturns. It was also said that the contemplated edition would be made obligatory only upon the newly ordained to sacred orders, whilst the rest of the clergy would be free to use the old editions with which priests are familiar. We may state authoritatively that this intelligence was simply conjectural and based upon the fact that the Holy Father had appointed a *commissio liturgico-historica*, consisting of Father Ehrle, S.J., and Mgr. Wilpert, both German priests resident in Rome, together with some other ecclesiastics, whose task it will be to carry out certain provisions regarding a revision of the Canonical Office proposed at the late Vatican Council.

We have on a former occasion spoken of this matter. It is conceded on all sides that there are in the present text of the Canonical Office certain defects which call for correction. If it be asked why these have ever been allowed to stand, and stand so

long as to have attained a certain authorization from the Church, we give the same answer that is made when there is a question of certain textual defects, errors of reading, of form, in the present versions of the Bible. Indeed a very large portion of the defects which need to be corrected in what may be called the priests' Prayer-Book, rests upon an erroneous reading of Scriptural versions, or upon an equally erroneous interpretation of certain texts by the early ecclesiastical writers. Other defects are recognized in a certain simplicity assuming as historical facts statements which, to the critical mind of modern times, convey the impression of credulity or unreasonable extension of that piety which courts faith where reason would suffice. To do away with these defects is likely to be a labor of many years, and anyone who recalls the work of former commissions appointed to a like task of emendation, will understand that the prospect of having a new Breviary different from the present *editio typica* of Fr. Pustet & Co. is far distant. At any rate, the idea of legislating on the subject of its actual introduction, before there has been a decision from the S. Congregation of Rites as to the adoption of any emendations in the Breviary, is on a level with pure newspaper gossip.

Some questions, however, of practical importance suggest themselves in speaking of this subject. First: Why is the emendation of the Breviary needed at all? Why did the Church tolerate a defective edition; nay, why did she make obligatory the very recitation of errors, by her authorizing an *editio typica* to which all printers and readers were obliged to conform under pain of censure? Does not this militate against her infallibility, or at least against her traditional wisdom? And, furthermore, there is the interesting question as to what are the things that should be emended? They are surely not typographical errors merely? And if there be errors of fact or of interpretation, how can the Church permit the change and tolerate a departure from the traditions which are bound up with her very teaching? It is an old saying and a true one, that the prayers of the Church embody her doctrine, and that therefore her liturgy, handed down from Apostolic days until now without change, testifies to her earliest teachings. Thus the form of her prayers becomes the rule

and the testimony of her faith—*forma orandi est lex credendi.* If this be true, how can the Church countenance, much less contemplate, any changes which since they involve years of active research by learned and wise men, must be something more than mere verbal alterations, translation, or construction? These are important questions, for, as a matter of fact, the changes needed are substantial. They will require the elimination of whole chapters which contain false statements of fact, erroneous interpretations of doctrinal precepts resting upon a false exegesis, and misplaced references to authorities that have no just claim for recognition. But this difficulty demands fuller treatment in a separate article.

"DEW-A-DIGON."

The title-page of a recently published volume by Monsignor John Vaughan,[1] bears, rather prominently in a scroll, beneath the author's name, the legend *Dew-a-Digon.* Several readers have asked us what is the significance of the phrase. The meaning of the words themselves is easily discoverable, since they are found not only in the Welsh language, but also in the Breton and the Celtic dialects generally, standing either for "God and enough," or, "God will also lead (provide)." That the former is the actual meaning which the phrase is intended here to convey we learn from Monsignor Vaughan himself. It is simply the motto found under the author's family crest; and he uses it for his publications, "so as to form a sort of connecting link between one and the other of his works." The Arabs have a similar expression, *Allah charîm,* meaning that God will take care of His creatures, and that therefore all anxiety for the morrow is to be set aside. Indeed, the phrase is Scriptural, and numerous paraphrases of it may be found in both Testaments. Hence, besides being a family motto, and what commercial people might call the author's trade-mark, the expression could be regarded as a happy selection embodying one of those pithy phrases which tell the gist and drift of a book's main contents or purpose. The words *Dew-a-Digon,* whether we accept the meaning of "God and enough," or that of "God will also provide," are thus simply a condensed form of a passage found in a Letter of St. Paul to the Hebrews (13: 5, 6), in which he

[1] *Earth to Heaven.* St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

exhorts them to be "contented with such things as you have, for He (God) hath said: I will not leave thee, nor will I forsake thee. So that we may confidently say: The Lord is my helper." In another Epistle (1 Tim. 6: 8) the Apostle expresses the same sentiment in similar paraphrase: "Godliness with contentment is great gain; having food and wherewith to be covered, with these we are content." Thus without doing violence to the sense of Monsignor Vaughan's favorite motto, we may regard it as a sort of key to the teaching which he undertakes to popularize through his volume, *Earth to Heaven*, by leading our mind from our present and necessary condition of mortality to that for which we are destined in heaven, a task accomplished in that tranquillity of order which men call peace and contentment. But this is merely our own interpretation.

THE PHILIPPINE CONTROVERSY.

Some months ago we published an article on the subject of the Philippine controversy, which provoked much criticism from magazine and newspaper writers who were alive to the religious and economic interests involved. There had been a manifest inclination on the part of our Government officials to yield to the pressure of a prejudiced public opinion, which discredited Spanish rule, or rather the Friars who were supposed to represent that rule. Hence there was good reason why Catholics of influence should let their voices be heard, in order that our Government might be led into a complete and searching examination, so as to insure fair dealing to the Catholic subjects of the Islands. Those who were inclined to use their influence in this direction might indeed seem to abandon the attitude of respectful loyalty and, in their demand for justice, assume a position of aggressiveness. Such is, of course, the citizen's right; and in proportion as a government is swayed by the sense of equity or of policy, it would be lawful to appeal either to its representatives or to public opinion.

But whilst we avail ourselves of this right it must not be forgotten that in the case of legitimate government the ultimate verdict must come from the tribunal, the court of law, represented

by such government, and that we may not forestall it as unfavorable so long as there is evidence that the highest authority is disposed to correct past errors and to safeguard the rights of its citizens, whatever those rights may import in the estimation of the majority. We are bound, moreover, to the duty of respect for the persons, if not for their views and enactments, who represent the popular judgment. They are judges, and it is the rule in every court to keep this respect intact. If it is ever violated by those who yield only to secular control, it may never be violated with impunity by those who claim to be dutiful, for it is contempt of court to do so; and contempt of court is incompatible with defence of right, except in cases where revolution is legitimate on principles of right ethics.

This it is all the more important to remember when we stand forth as religious champions of religious freedom. That cause demands from us not only just respect for lawful actual authority, not only honesty and truthfulness in presenting our grievances, or in stating the injury done by those who violate the common rights, but also that prudence which dictates safe tactics in an important warfare. It may be objected that heroism is not always prudent; but then heroism is something very different from the bravado that merely wishes to attract attention or to cultivate profitable notoriety. We knew an old lawyer, able and respected, who gave this one parting lesson to his son, when he sent him to the pleader's bar: "Take infinite pains to get your facts, repeat them as often as they help you to point out a conclusion, but never *exaggerate* either the facts or their importance." It was a wise lesson, for if once your jury realizes the fact that you exaggerate in a single instance, they will discount all your statements in proportion, no matter how true they may be.

And this lesson we considered of grave importance in reference to the controversy on the Philippines, as it was carried on in behalf of the Friars. A good portion of the Catholic press seemed disposed to print anything that made against the Government and to extol the action of Catholics. If it was important that our demands should be heeded not only by the well disposed among the authorities, but by the public at large, it was equally important that we should make them on the ground of ascertained facts; or, if that

was not possible at once, upon principles recognized by law and equity which would allow no verdict until examination had been completed. To make appeals that might intimidate, but might not have a sound basis of proof, could not profit the Catholic cause. We have clear evidence of this in the question of the schools of our own children, wherein we do not even enjoy the public representation allowed for Catholics in Protestant countries such as England and Germany. Yet liberty is not talked of in those countries in the boastful strains which we hear in our land—even in our churches, whenever the patriotic wind blows in through the sacristy.

But this is hardly the occasion to repeat the old argument for wisdom as well as courage in warfare, however profitable it might be to do so. We said most of what we meant to say in the article referred to, which, although it aroused some sensitiveness, was properly understood and commended by many as a reasonable check to extravagant zeal.

With this issue, however, we are happy to do more than criticise. Our readers will be pleased to have a true version of the things effected by the investigation of Philippine affairs. The article by Dr. Middleton will aid the student of modern history and the citizen to understand many things that affect the rights of conscience and the important issues of religion, not only in the Philippines, but also at home. The statements of the eminent Augustinian are not conjectures; they are facts supported by documents of a legal character, and such as are likely to be recognized on both sides of the controversy. The following outlines of topics corresponding to the separate sections of the article will give an idea of the scope of Dr. Middleton's argument. After an introductory fixing the *status quaestionis*, the author reviews the Church statistics in the Philippines for the year 1898—Charges against the Philippine Reports—Genesis of these Charges—Mode of Procedure in the Commissions—Some Facts of Philippine Story—Preliminary Conclusions. The article is supplemented by an *Appendix* containing the following items: Interrogatories put to the Native Witnesses—Character of the Native Witnesses—Pueblo Schools—Law obliging Attendance—School-Course—Final Conclusions.

We have then here a defence of the Friars which is reasoned and just. That such a defence does not imply that there is nothing to be changed or corrected in the ecclesiastical sphere, is plain enough from the letter of our Holy Father, which we print in this issue from the excellent translation which *The Messenger* was the first to present to its readers.

The article is to be supplemented by further statistics from Spain and the Philippines which are being copied, and which will furnish a complete and searching survey of this very important subject.

SOME SUGGESTIONS REGARDING THE INSTRUCTION OF CONVERTS.

(By the Rev. Wm. I. Simmons.)

We are all familiar with the great care exercised, in the early Church, in the instruction and reception of converts. How they went through a long preparation of *audientes*, *genuflectentes*, *competentes;* how the mysteries of faith were gradually unfolded to them, until, after a lengthy probation, they were finally admitted to a full participation in the liturgy and the sacraments. But circumstances have changed since then. Those were pagan days. The general principles, at least, of Christianity pervade the world to-day, and the long period of probation is not necessary. But while there is no fear of a lapse into paganism, yet there is danger, with all the sophisms that are abroad, of a return to Protestantism, or of a seduction into agnosticism. And therefore there is need of having the neophyte well grounded and well instructed in the faith.

Although in certain details the instruction of a convert may differ in our age, yet in the general principles we cannot do better than learn of such great matsers as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Augustine. The former, in his *Instructions to the Catechumens*, gives us an explanation of the creed, prayer, and the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Eucharist, which, for simplicity and trenchant thought, has never been surpassed in modern times, and which is a lesson to us of the careful and thoughtful manner in which converts should be instructed. While St. Augustine's letters to the Deacon Deogratias on *Catechizing the*

Uninstructed treat of every phase, both of the manner of dealing with converts, and the matter for their instruction, and is well worthy a perusal by those who have converts to instruct.[1]

Taking this work of St. Augustine as a basis, let us consider some of the practical points in this important matter. And if sometimes we may appear to be putting forth our personal views, it is only that we are giving expression to the knowledge we have gained from those who have a larger experience and a deeper wisdom than ourselves—such masters in the art as Father Hecker, Father Hewitt, and their great disciple, Father Elliott.

In the first place our manner with inquirers should be kindness itself, joined to a spirit of cheerfulness. Very much depends on the reception inquirers get when they first meet a priest. It may seem very unreasonable to one who has always had the faith, but a very large proportion of inquirers are very timorous when they take the first steps toward entering the Church. If they have been well grounded in their own sect, it seems like disloyalty to their ancestors, like dishonor to their parents and those who have had charge of their religious training, to say nothing of the breaking of friendships and social ties which often follows. Consequently any brusqueness or severe handling may almost extinguish the spark of grace which has been enkindled within them. They should be received with a courtesy, a gentleness, and above all a frankness of manner which will reassure them and give them confidence. And in imparting instruction our earnestness of manner should impress the inquirer with the conviction that the Catholic Faith must be the true religion of Christ. There should be no lethargy, no lassitude, nothing to indicate that we are merely performing a duty; but, on the contrary, that we have the zeal of one who *believes* in what he is teaching and whose belief is so real that he wants to carry the light of conviction to others. This was the secret of the great force of Father Hecker, whether in preaching or conversing. At times, when under special mental strain, Fr. Hecker was afflicted with severe headaches. We have known him at such a time, when his head was all tied up and he could not leave his room,

[1] There is, also, a valuable chapter on "Converts" in Dr. Stang's *Pastoral Theology*.

on being told that there was someone who wanted to make inquiry about the Church, tear off his bandages, go down to the parlor and forget all about his headache.

The first thing to find out from an inquirer is, what led him to the Church. After satisfying him that he is not intruding, that we are most pleased to assist him in his inquiries, the question should be: "Why do you want to become a Catholic?" There are so many motives and so many circumstances leading to this act, that it is most important to learn this at the beginning. Some are attracted by the charm of her liturgy; others by the beauty of her doctrine; some who have been borne down by trouble and affliction, and have found no sustaining power in Protestantism; occasionally marriage is the motive. These last are the only ones to be mistrusted. Having found out the motive leading the inquirer towards the Church, the next step is to learn in what form of Protestantism he has been brought up. This will be a great help toward knowing how to deal with him.

Before commencing to instruct the inquirer, one of the most important things, which should never be omitted, is to tell him that we will explain everything about the Catholic Church, her doctrines and worship, and that at the end, if he wishes to become a Catholic, we will be glad to receive him into the Church; but if he should not be entirely convinced, he will be just as free as before he came to us. We must assure him that we shall not urge him, that there can be only one reason for his entering the Church, and that is the salvation of his own soul. Before entering on the instruction, the inquirer should be told to pray fervently for God to enlighten and direct him; especially to the Holy Ghost. Tell him to ask God, if the Catholic Church is the true Church, to give him the grace to realize it, and perhaps it is well to require some definite prayer, say, *e.g.*, the Our Father.

Having now arrived at the stage of instruction, the first question which arises is: How much time should be devoted to instruction?

We are well aware of the long period of probation required in the early centuries. We should certainly use equal care, according to the changed circumstances. No one should be received into the Church with less than from three to five months

of instruction and probation. We say *no one*. Of course occasionally we come across a person who has a thorough knowledge of the Church's teaching and even her worship. But these are rare exceptions. Ordinarily we should go through the Baltimore Catechism from beginning to end, and this cannot be done in less than from three to five months, according to the intelligence of the inquirer, with, say, two instructions a week. If he be not well instructed before reception into the Church, he may never become so, and a half-instructed convert is at a great disadvantage. Besides it is important to test the perseverance of the inquirer. If he attends regularly and keeps up his interest during that length of period, he will probably persevere after becoming a Catholic.

In giving the instruction, several points are to be observed. The inquirer should be required to learn the chapters in the Catechism on which the instruction is to be given, or at least to read them over carefully beforehand. The instruction should be in the simplest manner possible, without any pretence to superior knowledge. And it should be instruction pure and simple without any argumentation. Let the truths stand for themselves. Just as one would give instruction to children preparing for First Communion. Of course there must be variation in the instruction according to the intelligence and education of the inquirer, and for the uneducated we must illustrate with many examples and similitudes.

The inquirer should be encouraged to ask questions, and, if he be intelligent, to propound objections, and these should receive respectful consideration, no matter how foolish or how absurd they may be. If they are serious and historical questions, it is well to lend or to suggest the reading of such authors as treat of the subject.

The instruction should not end with doctrine, but should include the ordinary practices of devotion which are necessary for the life of grace. The convert should be taught the morning and night prayers; how to hear Mass; and of course also the *practical* part of the Sacrament of Penance. This is sometimes overlooked. It may under circumstances be prudent to warn converts against being too exacting in regard to the conduct of

those who have from childhood up enjoyed the blessings of faith, and in whom those who would carry our beautiful doctrine of grace to its most logical extreme, look for a corresponding sanctity of conduct. It is prudent, therefore, to explain to them the difference between the life of grace and the life of perfection, and, furthermore, that the gift of faith does not lift us out of the weaknesses of human nature. They will thus be prepared to find all kinds in the Church,—the good and the bad, the lukewarm and the fervent.

All this may imply a good deal of labor on the part of the priest, and if so much attention has to be given to a single convert it might be asked: "Is it worth the while?" We can only answer that if our Blessed Lord promised a reward to the one who should give a cup of cold water in His name, how much more will He reward His priest who gives the light of divine faith to one who was sitting in darkness and the shadow of death. Few of us but have our faults and imperfections, and it is opportunities of this kind that, perhaps, will appeal to the Master, who will say: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: Thou didst instruct many to justice, thou shalt shine as a star for all eternity." (Matt. 25: 13; Dan. 12: 3.)

In the case of female inquirers much of this labor may be saved us by handing it over, if it can be done, to the Sisters, or some intelligent laywoman in the parish. Women understand, as a rule, the feminine mind and disposition better than we. All that remains for the priest to do is to make sure that the applicant has been properly instructed, and to supplement the examination by some further details on the doctrines of the Church, etc.

This paper might be deemed incomplete without a mention of certain books useful to inquirers and converts. In the first place, there is probably no book more useful to new converts than Bagshaw's *Threshold of the Catholic Church.* In it is contained much information of a practical nature, which it would take the ordinary convert months to become acquainted with. For the inquirers, of course, such books as: *The Faith of Our Fathers; Plain Facts;* for Episcopalian inquirers there is no better book than Stone's [Fr. Fidelis] *Invitation Heeded.* There are also many others: *Pepper and Salt, Clearing the Way*, and *The Question Box*, which

has just been published and made up from questions asked on missions, and will be found useful in giving answers, in a pithy form, to many questions which may trouble the neophyte.

Some priests keep a number of these cheaper books on the table of the office or reception room of the rectory, to be given to any stray caller who may happen along from time to time. By this means persons who only called on business, have occasionally been led into the Catholic fold. "He must know that he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his ways, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." James 5 : 20.

THE "CARENTIA OVARIORUM" AS AN IMPEDIMENT OF MARRIAGE.

Those of our readers who have closely followed the discussion upon the above topic between the Rev. Dr. Casacca, O.S.A., of Villanova College, and Father Hild, C.SS.R., Professor of Moral Theology at the Ilchester Seminary, will be glad to see that (in the present number) the Jesuit Father Aug. Lehmkuhl, who, by reason of his works, is recognized both in America and in Europe as a leading scientific authority in matters of Moral Theology, has taken a hand in the dispute. As our veteran Jesuit contributor points out, the question is of an altogether practical character, and must therefore be answered upon practical lines. Theoretically there may be room for disputing the assumption that a union which owing to the absence of certain organs in the woman renders the marriage act unproductive, is nevertheless valid; but in view of the actual decisions of the S. Congregation in several cases submitted to its judgment, such a position cannot be maintained in practice. For, although the S. Congregation by its recorded decisions in individual cases does not pronounce upon all similar cases, thereby establishing an express law universally applicable, it nevertheless shows by the judgment given under definite circumstances what is the opinion by which the consultors were guided in their deliberation. Hence, although we may have no judicial decision, universally applicable, we have a judgment which permits a legitimate inference

as to other judgments in like circumstances. Such a judgment may indeed be reversed in future without prejudice to the tribunal claiming the right of adjusting its discipline to the requirements of time and place and persons, but it establishes a strong presumption regarding similar decisions. Now the S. Congregation has decided in particular cases that the absence of the *ovaria* and even of the *uterus* does not constitute either a permanent or a diriment impediment of marriage. Therefore we cannot in like cases maintain that it necessarily does so. Father Casacca did indeed endeavor to show that the cases upon which the S. Congregation pronounced were not such as to cover the whole question in principle, and therefore do not permit us to draw a conclusion applicable in general; but our Jesuit theologian goes into the analysis of the decisions and shows that they do not persmit a legitimate presumption of the existence of a diriment impediment at least until the S. Congregation declares the contrary.

The case then stands this way: A woman who is without ovaries, either by natural defect, or as a result of a surgical operation, may not be prevented from contracting marriage, provided she acquaint her intended husband beforehand with her condition. This latter provision is based on the natural right of a husband to desire and expect that his marriage will be blessed with offspring; he might therefore be unwilling to contract a marriage which deprives him of this expectation and fruit. Hence he must be warned beforehand against the error.

On the other hand, *theoretically* the subject is still open to discussion, since important reasons might arise why the S. Congregation should reverse its present judgment (as expressed in several specific cases). But until this is done, the confessor (respectively the matrimonial curia) is justified in deciding in favor of such marriages.

We should add that, after Father Casacca's answer to Father Hild's strictures of the former's contention, there would be due now a reply by our Redemptorist theologian; and Father Hild was actually prepared for this. Since, however, the article in this issue takes the view which Father Hild would defend, there may be no further necessity for discussion.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. The Code of Hammurabi.—Dr. Hugo Winckler[1] believes that the Code of Hammurabi is the most important document concerning Babylonian culture which has thus far been discovered. It was Fr. V. Scheil, O.P., the member for Assyriology attached to the French *Délégation en Perse*, who first published the text and a French translation of the curious inscription.[2] The find had been made in Susa, December, 1901–January, 1902. It is true that before Fr. Scheil's publication other legal documents, more or less contemporaneous with Hammurabi's Code, had been made accessible by Meissner,[3] Dr. Pinches,[4] Father Strassmaier,[5] and Father Scheil himself.[6] All these inscriptions, no doubt, will contribute their own little share to the proper understanding of Hammurabi's Code, and in their turn become the sharers in its light. But not one of the documents previously discovered can in any way claim to equal the systematic completeness of the latest find. It is on this account that Fr. Scheil's work has attracted already a great deal of attention; most probably, it will influence Old Testament study more vitally than did the Babylonian accounts of the creation and the flood. Among the proofs for the present interest in the question we may mention Dr. Pinches's paper read on November 12, 1902, before the Society of Biblical Archæology, Dr. Winckler's German translation of Father Scheil's French rendering,[7] Father Lagrange's article on the Code of Hammurabi,[8] and the "Notes on the Code of Ham-

[1] *Der Alte Orient*, iv, 4. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1902.

[2] Textes élamites-sémitiques, deuxième série, accompagnés de 20 planches hors texte, 4to, pp. 200. Paris : Leroux. 1902.

[3] Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht.

[4] Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets.

[5] Die altbabylonischen Verträge aus Warka.

[6] Une Saison des Fouilles a Sippar.

[7] *Der Alte Orient*, l. c.

[8] Revue biblique, January, 1903, p. 27 ff.

murabi" published by the Rev. C. H. W. Johns, Queen's College, Cambridge.[9]

The text of the inscription is chiseled on a splendid diorite, about 7 feet 2 inches in height, and from 5 feet 3 inches to a little over 6 feet in width. The front exhibits a representation of the sun-god dictating the law to Hammurabi, and, below this, sixteen lines of text, while the other side of the slab contains twenty-eight lines. Five lines of text have been erased, probably by the Elamites, when they transported the stone to Susa. Father Scheil in his translation divides the inscription into two hundred and eighty-two paragraphs, allowing the numbers between 66 and 99 for the lacuna. Father Lagrange arranges these paragraphs under the following headings: (1) unjust anathema against one's neighbor, pp. 1–2; (2) intimidation and corruption of witnesses, pp. 3–4; (3) injustice of judges, p. 5; (4) cases of theft, pp. 6–25; (5) military service and related questions of property, pp. 26–41; (6) cultivation of fields and orchards, pp. 42 ff.; (7) commerce, pp. 100–107; (8) liquor debts, pp. 108–111; (9) money express, p. 112; (10) relation of debtor to creditor, pp. 113–119; (11) deposits, pp. 120–126; (12) family life, marriage, engagement, heredity, pp. 127–184; (13) adoption, pp. 185–193; (14) bodily injuries, pp. 194–214; (15) on physicians, veterinary surgeons, and barbers, pp. 215–227; (16) on architects, builders, and ship captains, pp. 228–240; (17) letting of animals, pp. 241–249; (18) damage caused by animals, pp. 250–252; (19) hiring of men, animals, objects, pp. 253–277; (20) acquisition of slaves, pp. 278–282.

The foregoing sketch plainly shows that the Code of the Babylonian sun-god is of a civil rather than a religious character, and that even from a civil point of view it is not complete. Now, Hammurabi is generally identified with the king of Sennaar named Amraphel in Gen. 14; thus he becomes a contemporary of Abraham, though Dr. Winckler dates his reign about 2250 B. C. A comparison between the Babylonian and the Mosaic laws is therefore a subject of the highest interest and importance. The Rev. writer in the *Revue biblique* compares Ex. 21: 16, 37 and 22: 1–3 with the paragraphs of Hammurabi's law that refer to theft; similarly, he

[9] *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, January 1903, p. 96 ff.

compares Ex. 24: 4 and Lev. 19: 23 ff. with part of the Babylonian laws concerning the cultivation of fields and orchards; Rahab the harlot of Jericho as described in Jos. 2 furnishes a parallel to the Babylonian laws concerning liquor debts; Ex. 21: 2, 7 contains the Hebrew legislation corresponding to the part of Hammurabi's statutes on the relation between debtor and creditor; Ex. 21: 6 f. touches upon the question of deposits; Gen. 16: 6; 21: 10; Ex. 22: 15, 16 Lev. 20: 10; Num. 5: 11 ff.; Deut. 21: 15, 18 ff.; 22: 25, 28; 24: 1 ff. run parallel to the laws regulating the domestic affairs of the ancient Babylonians; Deut. 23: 17 bears on the question of adoption; Ex. 21: 15, 18–26; and Lev. 22: 19 f. consider the cases of bodily injuries; Ex. 21: 1 ff. reminds one of the Babylonian laws concerning barbers; Ex. 22: 9, 12, 14 is parallel to Hammurabi's enactments concerning the letting of animals; Ex. 21: 28 ff. resembles the Babylonian statute concerning damage caused by an animal.

On comparing these passages with the critical division of the Hexateuch, we see that Gen. 16: 6; Ex. 21: 1 ff., 6 f., 15 f., 18–26, 28 ff., 37; 22: 1–4, 9, 12, 14, 15 f. belong to the so-called Yahwist; Gen. 21: 10 belongs to the Elohist; Lev. 19: 23 ff.; 20: 10–12; 22: 19 f. are part of H or the Code of holiness; Deut. 21: 15, 18 ff.; 22: 25, 28; 23: 17; 24: 1 ff. belong to the Deuteronomist; Num. 5: 11 ff. belongs to P or the priest Code. Here, then, we seem to approach something like an archæological proof for the contention that in the Mosaic legislation we possess the record of a number of pre-Mosaic laws or customs written down by the Hebrew legislator, but modified or perhaps wholly abolished according to the needs of his own age. Again, we have another proof for the superiority of the Mosaic laws over those of Babylon from a humanitarian and moral point of view. It should also be noted that in Hammurabi's Code it is rather the supreme divinity than any particular god who inspires the Babylonian laws. But these are only a few of the many lines of study that meet in Hammurabi's Code as their proper centre.

2. Criticism of the New Testament.—During the course of last summer six popular lectures were delivered in St. Margaret's, Westminster, which are now published in book form.[10] The lec-

[10] Criticism of the New Testament, by W. Sanday, D.D., and others. London: Murray.

turers were Sanday, Kenyon, Burkitt, Chase, Headlam, J. H. Bernard. They treated of "the Criticism of the New Testament;" "Manuscripts;" "The Ancient Versions;" "The Canon;" "Dates of the Books;" and "The Historical Value of the Acts." We regret to state that the lectures contain a number of assertions which must appear extremely objectionable to the Catholic reader. Dr. Chase, *e.g.*, says that the Canon "was never the subject of any ordinance of a General Council;" again, he maintains, that the Books "do not all stand on the same level of certainty and authority;" he regards II Peter as of at least very questionable authenticity and canonicity. Dr. Bernard propounds a rather liberal view of inspiration: "we are," he says, "on insecure ground if we attempt to argue *a priori* from inspiration to inerrancy." But in spite of these drawbacks, the lectures, on the whole, are both up to date and conservative. Dr. Sanday, *e.g.*, accepts the position that the New Testament must be approached "like any other book." But while he is prepared to look the facts in the face as they are, he makes two reservations: First, the critics are to proceed more slowly, testing each step, on account of the importance of the subject; secondly, as the critics do not allow any assumptions in favor of Christianity, they ought not to make any assumptions against it. A document is therefore not to be put out of court, simply because it contains the account of a miracle.—We are glad to welcome the sixth edition of Mr. Hammond's little work "Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament."[11] Beginners will find it an excellent guide into the method and principles of textual criticism; it combines theory and practice in an especially clear and handy way.—The more advanced textual critic will find all the aid he needs in the work of Professor C. R. Gregory, the second volume of which[12] has now been published. The volume contains a repertory of the versions, a list of the ecclesiastical writers down to the twelfth century, and a list of authorities classified according to centuries and countries, thus furnishing a most handy book of reference.—*The Expositor*[13] gives first a criticism on Dr. Rendel Harris' con-

[11] Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[12] Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes; 8vo, pp. 514. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1902.

[13] November, 1902, p. 377 ff.

jectural emendation of I Peter 3 : 19, contributed by George Farmer; then Dr. Harris continues his former discussion, analyzing the amount of authority that ought to be granted to a conjectural emendation on which a number of critics happen to light independently.—We all remember the thorough defeat of the author of *Supernatural Religion* at the hands of Lightfoot; one can hardly understand how any writer has the hardihood of appearing again before the public after having been convicted of blunders without number. Lightfoot is dead, but, chameleon-like, the work of the anonymous author has appeared in a new form.[14] Of course, he believes that he has still something to say for himself and his peculiar views, and he endeavors to formulate his arguments so as to shield them against the force of Lightfoot's replies. But even at its best, the work can hardly be called a summary of rationalistic New Testament criticism. Both author and book belong to the past generation; our present critics have outgrown their spheres of thought.—Canon J. Armitage Robinson, of London, has just issued a little volume called *Study of the Gospels*, in which he endeavors to set forth in a popular but scholarly way the present methods and conclusions in studying these records of our Lord's life. The book endeavors to adhere to conservative principles; but Catholics can hardly agree with all the principles of the most conservative Protestants. Canon Robinson grants, *e.g.*, that the tradition concerning St. John's later life fully agrees with the phenomenon of the Gospel itself; in other words, the Gospel almost demands an author like the Apostle John such as he is in early Christian tradition. Can we therefore be sure of the historic accuracy of the Fourth Gospel. To expect that after such an interval, says the Rev. Canon, the evangelist's memory would reproduce the past with the exactness of dispatches written at the time, would be to postulate a miraculous interference; and we have no ground to suppose that the divine inspiration should so far disturb the normal condition of the human instrument. The contents of the Fourth Gospel are therefore an old man's recollections; yet, not merely such. They are rather the spiritual development of what the Apostle has heard and seen of his Master. The whole truth lies

[14] Watts. 6s. net.

in the great ideas of the prologue,[15] the rest is illustration. No need to say that such a defence of authenticity may preserve the shell, but it surrenders the kernel. Professor Fritz Hommel, of Munich, has contributed to *The Expository Times*,[16] an article entitled "The Logos in the Chaldæan Story of Creation." He endeavors to show that in the lists of primeval patriarchs, before man proper there appear two divine forms, namely Adam (= Alorus = Bab. Aruru) and Seth (= Alaparos = Bab. Adapada). Adapada or Seth is represented as corresponding to the Logos or the Memrā of the later tradition. Unless the reader is prepared to allow the cogency of arguments based on mythology, he will not be able to follow Professor Hommel in his elaborate deductions. Professor Schmiedel, of Zurich, devotes some interesting paragraphs to the question of the dependence of early Christian literature on Buddhism.[17] Schopenhauer's assertion that Jesus Himself depended on Buddha is dismissed as untenable. Nor do the oldest Gospels, namely, Mark and Matthew, exhibit traces of Buddhism. But, on the other hand, the Professor believes that the apocryphal gospels written between 150 and 700 A.D. certainly contain points of coincidence with the Buddhist gospels. He denies that these resemblances can be ascribed to mere accident. To prove his point, he advances three illustrations: (1) When the boy Buddha visited a temple, the brazen idols descended from their thrones and threw themselves at his feet; the legend concerning the Egyptian idol collapsing in the presence of the Infant Jesus is supposed to be a parallel to this. (2) The new-born Buddha is said to have looked all around him, and when he saw none like himself, to have taken seven steps to the north, saying: "I am the highest in the world." The apocryphal words of Jesus, addressed to His mother: "I . . . am Jesus, the Son of God, the Logos, as the angel Gabriel announced Me unto thee," are supposed to furnish the parallel of Buddha's words. (3) Both Buddha and Jesus, according to the apocryphal gospels, put their teachers to shame when they first went to school. But on considering the entire difference of relation between Buddha

[15] I : 1–18.

[16] Dec. 102, p. 1903 ff.

[17] Principal Problems in the Life of Jesus.

and the idols on the one hand, and Jesus and the idols on the other, one can hardly establish a parallelism between the incidents related under No. 1. Both the words and their setting of Buddha are so different from the words and their accompanying action of Jesus in Nos. 2 and 3, that no impartial critic will find more than an accidental agreement between them.—Mr. J. R. Wilkinson has published a pamplet[18] in which he has attempted to disentangle from the present text of the first chapter of the Gospel of St. Luke an earlier tradition concerning the birth of St. John the Baptist. Traces of this tradition are said to appear in St. Luke 1: 5–25 and 57–66. It appears to be a narrative originally not connected with the history of the infancy of Christ. Mr. Wilkinson suggests that this tradition may have been handed down among the disciples of St. John, as distinct from the disciples of Jesus Christ. Since the third Evangelist himself testifies that he had recourse to various sources in order to write his Gospel with greater accuracy, the assumption of such a Johannean source does not in the least interfere with the dogma of the inspiration of the third Gospel.

3. **Commentary.**—Henry Bond, Borough Librarian, Woolwich, contributes to *The Expository Times*[19] a first instalment of an article on "The Best Bible Commentaries." The writer says that in his professional duties as librarian he has found the problem of pointing out the best commentaries on the different books of the Bible more difficult than the selection of the best books in any other department of knowledge. In consequence he had recourse to the device of sending out blanks with questions concerning the best scholarly and the best popular commentaries on each particular book of the Bible. The forms were sent to recognized theologians and scholars, and about sixty of them were returned with the information desired. The reader will find the list, as far as it is given in the present number of *The Expository Times*, most interesting and useful. We need not state that not a single Catholic commentary is named among the favored ones. In some future number, we may find space to print

[18] A Johannine Document in the First Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel. Royal 8vo. 1902. 1s. 6d.

[19] Jan., 1903, p. 131 ff.

a similar list of commentaries that Catholics may have recourse to.—Bernhard Schäfer's series of Catholic commentaries has received a new accession in Dr. Paul Riessler's explanation of the Book of Daniel.[20] The reader is acquainted with the general characteristics of this series, viz., conciseness, clearness, and solidity. The present volume is not lacking in any of these qualities. In explaining the celebrated seventy weeks in Dan. 9, the author appears to favor the identification of the anointed prince with Cyrus, and of the predicted desolation with the downfall of Jerusalem under Antiochus IV. The beginning of the seventy weeks falls, therefore, in 605 B. C., the end of the seven weeks in 558 B. C., or the time of Cyrus; the end of the sixty-two weeks in 171 B. C. But the more common explanation is not positively excluded.

[20] *Das Buch Daniel.* Wien: Mayer & Co. 1902.

Criticisms and Notes.

SAINT AUGUSTINE AND HIS AGE. By Joseph McCabe. London: Duckworth & Co. 1902. Pp. x—441. Price, 6s. net.

A history of St. Augustine, written from a Pelagian standpoint, is a novelty, if nothing else. Mr. McCabe describes his work pretentiously as an "attempt to interpret the life of one of the most famous saints of the Christian Church, by the light of psychology rather than by that of theology." But he is constrained to add that he discards the 'perverse type' of biography followed by Augustine himself in his 'seductive *Confessions*'—a strange statement, considering his expressed predilection for psychological delineation of character of which perhaps no human document is so full as *The Confessions*—for a story told with a "saving tincture of Pelagianism." Were the great British heresiarch[1] of the fifth century to come to life to-day, he would see in the creed of naturalism embraced by Mr. McCabe the child of his own religious thought. For Mr. McCabe professes throughout his book an ostentatious regard and sympathy for Pelagian tenets, mixed with a tinge of lofty contempt for the narrow-minded opposition of Augustine, to whom he apostrophizes in the following delightful strain: "Probably [the Saint] little knew, when he began throwing stones, how fragile a house he had entered." "Alas for Augustine's '*vastissimum ingenium*.'"

"Pelagian," then, is the correct epithet to apply to this strange biography. The author claims to be an unbiassed historian, but his own strong religious prejudices get the better of his no doubt sincere intentions. In parts the book reads like an imitation of Gibbon. Elsewhere it suggests an immature effort of a prentice-hand. What are we to say of the equipments of a writer for the rôle of a serious historian who can express himself in such a schoolboyish fashion as this: "If Constantine had chanced to stake his fortune on Mithra instead of Jesus in his decisive battle, it is difficult to say what might have happened." "[Augustine's] real mental growth consisted in an accumulation of disjointed facts and thoughts, the formation of a treasury of knowledge which could be drawn upon in later years. . . .

[1] Mr. McCabe rejects the tradition that Pelagius was a monk of Bangor and his real name Morgan, as one based "solely on a late and unconvincing legend."

But he had no leading thoughts wherewith to order the storing of his harvest, and to his last days his erudition, such as it was, remained an uncritical and an undigested mass." "It is probable that Manicheism did no more than Christianity towards the purification of the empire"?

This irresponsibility of expression makes us sceptical about Mr. McCabe's pretensions to historical accuracy on points of fact. He thinks it "clear" that "the Africans had no notion whatever of Papal Supremacy," on the slender authority of what he has "said in connection with the Donatist controversy."[2] The Catholic student will prefer the well-weighed words of Cardinal Newman, who testified that it was the history of the Donatists of the fourth and fifth centuries that sounded in his ears the death-knell of his allegiance to a Church in rebellion against the Apostolic See. The "Securus judicat orbis terrarum" that settled for ever the claims of the Donatist schism to represent Catholicism also led the latter-day Augustine home to the divinely-appointed centre of unity.[3]

On a purely historical subject, such as the moral state of Rome at the time of its fall, we find the author quite as untrustworthy as a guide. He lays down the law with the *ipse dixit* dogmatism of a village schoolmaster. If Döllinger, Ozanam, and Villemain agree with contemporary writers like Ammianus, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, in painting in the darkest colors the corruption of dying Rome, it only shows to our superior "maker of history" that they are incapable of judging evidence, since they "shrink from a careful study of vice in any age." If it be objected that the educated world believes implicitly in the unutterable iniquity of Rome, and finds "no mystery in its fall," the answer is very simple—"*The world is wrong.*" It is puzzling to read after these flat denials of a position that is commonly thought to need no argument, that "the corruption of Rome, for several centuries dissolving the physical and moral vigor of the race, aided the process of destruction." The most charitable hypothesis to account for this *lacuna* (typical of many others) in our Pelagian historian's argument is that he has not sufficiently weighed his words or the thoughts that he wished to express by them.

[2] Yet he elsewhere admits that St. Augustine is strangely silent about the appeals to Rome in the case of Apiarius.

[3] Mr. McCabe discusses at length the question of St. Augustine and the Papal Claims in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1902, pp. 685-695, that might well have formed an Appendix to the present volume.

He shows wide reading on the literature of his subject—to take him at his own valuation, he is as familiar with the ponderous tomes of St. Augustine as with the Pagan eighteenth century, and recent writers on the period of his study—but it is another question whether he has properly digested the books which he has devoured. This suspicion makes the cautious reader more inclined to trust Mr. McCabe in his picturesque descriptions of men and things than in his superficial generalizations, rash dogmatizings, and profitless speculations.

The graphic account of Carthage, the "third city of the Empire," (built upon the ruins of the great seaport ruthlessly destroyed by Scipio in 146 B. C.) at the time of Augustine, from the scenic, the social, the philosophical, and the religious sides, shows a wide acquaintance with contemporary writers, Christian and Pagan. Procopius's *Secret Life* is adduced in support of his contention that the theatres in the early part of the fourth century were a veritable sink of iniquity. The author might, at this period, have alluded with advantage to the institution of Miracle Plays by the Christian Church in order to combat, by a rival attraction, the moral evils of the secular stage—an important point brought out by a recent writer in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.[4]

The moral atmosphere in which Augustine lived was on a par with the corruption of the drama. Salvianus, a priest of Marseilles, who looked upon the invasion of the barbarians as the divine punishment for the sins of the Empire in its decadence, declares, in words whose truth remains uncontradicted, that "Carthage was the cesspool of Africa, and Africa was the cesspool of the world." The same fact is apparent from St. Augustine's sermons to the Carthaginian Christians, who appear to have had only the most primitive conceptions of sexual morality.

Referring more particularly to Augustine's well-known moral lapse before his conversion, Mr. McCabe makes out a strong case for exaggeration on the subject in the *Confessions* written in later life.[5] The penitent Saint, looking back on youthful misdeeds through the haze of years which had changed the whole current of his thoughts, was the last man to spare himself from the reproaches of morbid self-introspection, or to weigh dispassionately the sins of his youth. If he

[4] See an article, by the Rev. W. R. Carson, on "Miracle Plays," in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1902.

[5] At an earlier period he waxes contemptuous at the "utterly false psychology and ethic" of the *Confessions*– a too sweeping statement that defeats its own end.

could speak in language that would not be too severe for a murder, in condemnation of a boyish theft of a few pears, he might equally distort the significance of other crimes. More insight is shown into the moral workings of Augustine's mind than into its religious development. The author has nothing but praise for the broad-minded position of Augustine the Manichean; he has scanty sympathy with the unwearying onslaughts against heretics by voice and pen of Augustine the Saint. With his customary desire to set contemporary authorities right, he maintains that the tenets of Manicheism have been "persistently misrepresented by Augustine's biographers." The purpose of his sneer is obscure since he goes on to admit that "it is likely that [Augustine] correctly describes, on the whole (*sic*), the Manicheism he embraced in the fourth century," and his own rhetorical account of the principles of the sect is no more than an extension of passages in the *Confessions*.

We have little quarrel with Mr. McCabe's analysis of the intellectual growth of Augustine's diverse beliefs. A study of "mathematics" in its three branches of arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy, led him at Carthage, as a youth of eighteen, into his first religious *cul-de-sac* —a blind belief in the auguries of astrologers. The philosophical explanation of the existence and power of evil—that granite wall against which generations of religious thinkers have beaten their heads in vain—given by the Manichean system led him astray from the Catholic faith to accept a gross materialism. Dimly and gradually he came to see that God was in a higher world than that which the senses could comprehend. Through Plotinus and Plato he reached the Divine Christ. "Plato's doctrine of the Logos (borrowed from Moses, according to St. Justin) had, as it was presented by Plotinus, a singular resemblance to that of St. John. Plato's Trinity, as described by Plotinus, was sufficiently rational to recommend itself, and sufficiently Alexandrian to recommend the Nicene Creed." Neo-Platonic ideas concerning the spiritual nature of the imperishable realities—beauty, truth, goodness—severed one by one the links that bound him to Manicheism, until he found himself almost unconsciously safely landed in the "fair haven" of Catholicism. A Christian Platonist he remained to the end, and his long search after truth was rewarded by an abiding peace.

We gladly welcome Mr. McCabe's careful study of the phases of St. Augustine's mental development. We could wish that he had shown an equal sympathy with the Christian outlook of his subject.

He would then have spared himself the cheap sneer at the Saint's views on that virginity which he counted the dearest possession of the spouses of the Virgin-born; and the Catholic reader would not be irritated at would-be smart witticisms, that smack more of the infidel Gibbon than of an impartial historian, at the expense of the learning and charity of one of the greatest Doctors and Saints of the Universal Church, and at caustic criticisms, too obviously the result of a jaundiced mind to carry conviction. About Mr. McCabe's ability and powers of narration, as epigrammatic as they are fascinating—we would particularize the chapter on "The Dying of Paganism," and the description of the invasion of Numidia by the Vandals under Genseric, the Bismarck of the fifth century—there cannot well be question; we regret that we cannot say the same of his judicial temper as a trustworthy historian or of his powers of *spiritual* insight into the energizings and communings of the soul of a great Saint.[6]

THE BIBLE AND MODERN CRITICISM. By Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., LL.D. With a Preface by the Right Reverend Handley C. G. Moule, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1902. Pp. xvi—278.

Protestant laymen cannot be fairly accused of apathy as regards theological questions. Anglican Church papers recently recorded the death of Sir William Roberts-Austen, an eminent scientist occupying an official position in the Royal Mint, who not merely built the unique wayside Italian church that forms so prominent a feature in the landscape of Blackheath in Surrey, but often preached from its pulpit; and now we have from the press a learned treatise in defence of the position assailed by Biblical High-Critics from the pen of Sir Robert Anderson, a well-known lawyer, at one time the head of the criminal investigation department of the detective headquarters at Scotland Yard, London.

Without any special training in theology, never, we suppose, in his life having sat on a hard bench under a lecturer on Scripture's chair, this typical man of the world (in the best sense) enters fearlessly into the arena to do battle with the Goliaths of European fame. It would be beside the mark to compare him to David, for he scouts

[6] We may add that, in spite of his assurance that he was "once the happy possessor of a theological microscope," he does not display a very keen theological scent, *e. g.*, in his persistent use of "Arian" and "Unitarian" as interchangeable terms.

such humble weapons as stone and sling, ranking himself without a qualm of embarrassment in a category superior to the most famous of the critics. The trained theological scholar who most sympathizes with his views will be provoked to smile when he reads that Sir Robert Anderson's previous work (little known outside a limited evangelical circle) under the title "David in the Critics' Den," has completely routed the Higher Criticism, and he will not thank him for the recapitulation of its arguments which, with sublime self-satisfaction, he gives in the present work as conclusive. This egotism runs throughout the book. The author assumes the Papal tiara and speaks *ex cathedrâ* on point after point of knotty controversy. In one place (p. 165) he settles conclusively a vexed question of Biblical chronology; in another (p. 149) he routs the critics on the narrative of Jonah; in a third (pp. 44, 149, etc.), he passes in review the Hebraic scholarship of Doctors Driver and Cheyne; in a fourth he sneers at the theories of learned Egyptologists (pp. 137, 162). Ordinary sense of humor would have saved him from much of the pretentious dogmatism and overweening vanity that spoil the soundness of his strongest arguments. His tone is that of a pedagogue lecturing refractory schoolboys. Human nature finds it difficult enough to bend its knee before an authority that claims Divine sanction for its utterances; it is likely only to laugh at, when it does not contemptuously reject, the right of a self-constituted judge to lay down the law on theological problems about which the learned theologian speaks with bated breath—the more so when that very judge denounces a teaching authority in matters of doctrine with no uncertain voice. "Let us [he writes in language that Martin Luther might have employed][1] be done with grand-theology. The dark ages are past and gone. We belong to an age of enlightenment. The twentieth century has dawned. No Protestant . . . should fear free thought. To fall back upon authority and traditional beliefs is sheer apostasy from the principles of the Reformation."[2]

On a par with Sir Robert Anderson's theological assurance is his assumption of spiritual superiority to his opponents. "It would be," he says, "the merest affectation in one who knows even a little of the

[1] P. 185. It is to be presumed that Sir R. Anderson adopts these sentiments which, he says, contain "a definite element of truth," adding that he is predisposed to respond to such appeals.

[2] P. 185, *cf.* p. 45; where he holds up to contempt the "Irish peasant who grovels before his priest and takes the law from his mouth."

spiritual meaning and 'hidden harmony' of Scripture, to pretend that he can study such works as Hasting's 'Bible Dictionary,' and 'The Encyclopædia Biblica,' without being conscious of living in a sphere which most of the writers seem to have never entered, and of the very existence of which they display no knowledge." (Pp. 252–3.)

It is possible that his charge of unspirituality may be true in the case of certain of the more advanced critics, but the author shows no sense of discrimination, condemning equally moderate and extreme Biblical scholars who disagree with his own limited views based on as limited knowledge. We must add that the assumption of spiritual discernment sits ill on one who displays such ill-natured spleen (mixed with the venom of the un-Christian un-charity that thinketh evil), as is visible in the following passage, characteristic of several others: "The critics represent that the scholarship of Christendom is with them. But the claim is absolutely unfounded. Their apparent preëminence is due largely to their being adepts in the art of what the Americans call 'literary log-rolling.' They are 'a mutual admiration society.' No one of them can raise a cry but that the whole party responds. And then the secular press joins in." (P. 255.)

But what are we to say of the religious feeling of a writer who can compare the critical methods of his opponents—in this case the authors of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*—to the immoralities of the Merry Monarch? We question whether the most unspiritual of the higher critics has shown such conspicuous bad taste as Sir R. Anderson in the following passage which, we are sorry to say, does not stand alone: "Without help from France, Charles II could not so easily have overcome what he deemed English prudery; and so here foreign critics have been called in to force the pace with their British brethren." (P. 38, *cf.* pp. 36–7; 69–70.)

When we turn to the book itself to see how far it vindicates its author's claim to scholarship, learning, and judicial power of weighing evidence,[3] we have to confess to an astonishment that gives place to indignation (akin to the author's own "amazement and indignation" on p. 131) at the slender equipment of a writer with so many pretensions to superior knowledge. It is one thing to say of his opponents that they "know nothing of the typology of Scripture" (p. 258, note),

[3] Dr. Moule in his preface speaks of the author's training "in a severe school of legal and judicial investigation," fitting him peculiarly "to sift witnesses and weigh evidence."

"are ignorant of the language in which Christian doctrine is taught in the New Testament," and to state broadly that the Higher Criticism is no criticism at all; it is quite another to prove the possession of the solid learning of a theological expert that alone warrants such unsupported statements. Sir Robert Anderson, indeed, maintains with a delightful air of unconsciousness that "every book (he has) written gives proof of fearlessness in bringing critical methods to bear upon the study of Scripture;" but the fact that the higher critics have for the most part passed over in silence these "decisive victories" over their most cherished conclusions is the best proof of their real value. Certainly, if they are of the same calibre as the present work, or the one on "Daniel in the Critics' Den," we are not surprised at the fate which they have received.[4] But why should we prolong our criticism? The author himself abdicates his claim to serious attention when he declares that "any Christian who has made a life-study of the Bible is as competent to form an opinion upon it as the ablest Hebraist in Christendom" (p. 50, *cf.* p. 96). He mistakes vehemence of invective for solidity of argument. His opponents might with better reason hurl back at him the accusation of "pompous pedantry combined with a special type of ignorance" (p. 215, *note*), which he uses so freely, on the strength of his unsupported *ipse dixit*, against those who differ from him ("credulous fools" he elsewhere politely calls them). His lack of judicial discrimination is fairly illustrated by his sweeping criticism of the Revised Version (pp. 104–110), (backed singularly enough by the great name of Dr. Moule's predecessor in the See of Durham, Dr. Westcott). "In many instances," he writes, "the Revisers' changes in the text are new errors." On a par with this is his fulsome laudation of Dr. Hatch's "Bampton Lectures" as "one of the greatest theological books of the age."

The treatment of inspiration is typical of the rest of the book. Sir Robert Anderson makes the theological student hold up his hands in despair when he defines verbal inspiration (the backbone of his thesis) in language so vague that anyone might accept it. "It is," he says, embodied in the statement that "the record as given by each [sacred writer] was guided and controlled by the Spirit of God" (p. 228, *cf.* p. 79). He goes on from this slender premise to argue that

[4] On the other hand Sir Robert Anderson intervened with some measure of success in the celebrated dispute in the *Times*, between Mr. Gladstone and Professor Huxley, on the subject of the Mosaic Cosmogony.

our Lord's promise concerning the guidance of the Holy Spirit settles the question of inspiration. He has not a word to say to the divers arguments of the higher critics on the authorship of the books of the New Testament, except for a passing unsupported statement that the Second Epistle of St. Peter was written by the Apostle. Dr. Gore's theory on more or less Catholic lines, that the Bible, including the New Testament, must be accepted in the last resort on the authority of the Church, is dismissed contemptuously in a few sentences (pp. 172 ff).

The author is on surer ground when he attacks trenchantly the Kenoticism associated with the name of the last-mentioned writer. Whether the inspired record be the Pentateuch, the books of Jonah and Daniel, or Kings, the dilemma is the same. Either Christ's testimony to the divine authorship, and consequent veracity of the books of the Old Testament, is true from the fact that He was Omniscient God, or He was the fallible "dupe of a current Jewish notion." "No straining [he adds with clinching force] of the doctrine of Kenosis will cover this" false guidance on a matter of primary religious importance; "it brings us within sight of the great anti-Christian apostasy of the latter days" (p. 74).[5]

Considerable dialectical skill is also shown in a further passage where the erstwhile "irrefragable" conclusions of Schleiermacher, Baur and Strauss are lightly put aside as an "episode" by Professor Harnack—a fate that augurs ill for the finality of modern advanced criticism. If all the book were written in a similar strain we should have little cause of quarrel with it. We gladly admit the lucidity and strength of the author's style (racy enough for the most superficial reader), and the frequent originality of his thought; but, as a whole, it makes us wonder that Bishop Moule should have given it the hallmark of his name. It is true that his Lordship disclaims sympathy with the tone of certain passages and details in the subject-matter (p. v); but he does not hesitate to describe the volume as "an example of exactly the sort of work which the Church needs in an eminent degree" (p. vi). We wish we could share in the Bishop's optimism. It is just because we have at heart the same principles which Sir Robert Anderson holds perhaps in an exaggerated form, that we deplore their present uncritical and haphazard defence. If strong statements and violent personalities could do duty for solid arguments, the author would

[5] *Cf.* pp. 71–73, 175–176. 265.

have proved *ex abundanti cautela* his qualifications for his self-imposed task as the champion of orthodoxy. As it is, we greatly fear that his book is calculated to do more harm than good. It remains a melancholy witness to the impotence of amateur attacks on the impugners of the authority of Scripture from the non-Catholic camp. No one will question Sir R. Anderson's courage; most unbiassed readers will wish that it had been tempered with discretion and a more accurate scholarship.

RELIGION AS A CREDIBLE DOCTRINE. A Study of the Fundamental Difficulty. By W. H. Mallock. Pp. 287. London: Chapman & Hall. 1903. Price, 12s. net.

The "Fundamental Difficulty" which Mr. Mallock essays to meet is the *rationale* of free-will in the scheme of human things. In the pages of the London *Fortnightly Review*, a year ago, he criticised at great length the arguments of Father Maher, S.J., in his contribution to the Stonyhurst manuals of Catholic Philosophy on "Psychology" (a work that won for its author the degree of Doctor of Literature from the University of London, in spite of the fact that the examiner's own position was stoutly rebutted in it). The present elaborate volume is the outcome of those articles in an enlarged form. Besides meeting the fundamental difficulty of free-will, he attempts in it to buttress two other basal truths—the existence of a Personal God worthy of man's spiritual communion, and the continuance of human life after the body's death—which, together with it, constitute, he thinks, the essence of religion.

It will be necessary at this point, in order to make clear the subtle nature of his apologetic, to state what the book does *not* contain. In the first place, then, it is beyond its purpose to harmonize the doctrines of Revelation with the postulates of science. A main part of the book is taken up with an elaborate demonstration of the impossibility of defending Christianity by an appeal to apparently parallel truths in the scientific world. The author thinks that science and faith are poles asunder, denizens of separate kingdoms, on opposite sides of a wide, deep chasm, and that any attempt to bridge the intervening space is doomed to inevitable failure.

He modestly disclaims the intention of even settling what he regards as the rival claims of each champion, and pours abundant contempt on what he terms sarcastically "emotional apologetics." His office is merely that of a chartered accountant in the intellectual sphere who

casts up the items on either side, balances them, and gives the correct total. "What is wanted," he writes, "is an intellectual accountant, who will go carefully over the books of both the apologists of religion and the champions of science,"—not a *pseudo*-scientific theologian or an irreligious scientist.

Secondly, the book does not profess to be a detailed defence of the special doctrines of Christianity. Mr. Mallock is at pains to point out in more than one place (*cf.* especially the chapter on Free Will) that "the doctrines of religion which concern us . . . are not any doctrines which Christianity professes to reveal, but merely the doctrines which it, like other religions, presupposes"—*scil.*, the fundamental theses (familiar to students of Kant) of human freedom, of the existence of a Personal God, and of the continuous life of the soul after death. These three doctrines alone[1] make a "living religion possible," and it is the author's object to establish them on an impregnable basis.

How does he do so? His argument is twofold; the first part of the book is taken up with purely negative criticism, the second part is a brilliant constructive defence of Theism. Let us consider each line of thought separately.

We cannot do better than quote the summary which he gives of the conclusions of his negative criticism: "If," he writes, "we consider the universe apart from the organic life contained in it, it is . . . a system of absolute monism.[2] . . . We have also seen that . . . organic life is a system of absolute monism likewise, and that if in the cosmic process there has been any interference at any time, it was, to quote an expression of Professor Ward's, an 'interference that took place before the process began, not during it.' We have seen that, consequently, the entire intellectual system of religion —the doctrines of immortality, of freedom, and a God who is in relation to ourselves separable from this process—is not only a system which is unsupported by any single scientific fact, but is also a system for which among the facts of science it is utterly impossible for the intellect to find a place."

This is strong language, and it is difficult to see how a writer who uses it is other than a rationalist wolf wearing the fleece of a be-

[1] He terms them the "three essential dogmas" or "propositions" of religion.

[2] Monism as defined by Romanes is a form of idealism. It is the theory that "matter in motion is identical with mind." ("Mind, Matter, Monism.")

lieving sheep. He makes no secret of his intention to be "profoundly irritating" (to quote his own phrase) to those who attempt to make science the ally of faith. Respect for the weak brother is the last quality we would look for in him. He tears down ruthlessly the veils that apologists, from Bishop Butler to Father Maher, have industriously hung over the nakedness of Christian dogmas viewed from a scientific viewpoint. On the other hand, he shows an equal relish in lampooning the mistakes of eminent foes of Christianity. For he is no blind worshipper of great names. If he holds up Catholic theologians to ridicule, he accuses Mr. Herbert Spencer of "anthropomorphism with a vengeance," and criticises severely Professor Huxley's temporary forgetfulness of his own logical system of monistic Determinism in the interest of man's ethical dignity as analogous to "the antics of a barking dog in front of a locomotive engine." [3]

The two last-named philosophers are dragged later on at the wheels of Mr. Mallock's argument. From their fruitless attempts to invent an emotional substitute for Theism that will give an ethical sanction to man's conduct, he concludes that "belief in God and immortality is necessary to mental civilization." "How," he asks contemptuously, does Mr. H. Spencer's monistic conception of the universe "allow of our telling ourselves that the Universal Cause, of whose character we know nothing, would prefer that we did one necessary thing rather than another necessary thing, and that it is open to us to coöperate with the will of this mysterious gentleman?"

He next passes in review the idealistic school represented by Professor Ward, of Cambridge University, giving a particularly clear summary of the salient points of their teaching, with whose conclusions he shows evident sympathy, in spite of his criticism. Notwithstanding their efforts to distinguish between a "real world" without "existence" and an "existing world" without "reality" (surely, a nebulous theory in good sooth), he shows that they join hands with Determinists in denying Free Will. "As to his will [Mr. Mallock epitomizes the universal teaching of scientific philosophy as expounded by him], man is nothing but a mere machine [whose] life . . . [is] as a fleeting phenomenon which appears with the body and disappears with it, leaving nothing behind."

Or, as he expresses it elsewhere, "That entire conception of ex-

[3] He also pillories some of the arguments in the same work of Huxley's (*Evolution and Ethics*), remarking that the writer displays "a pitiable piece of card-sharping with words and ideas."

istence which alone, for the mass of mankind, has invested life with value, is in absolute opposition to that general system of the universe, the accuracy of which is every day re-attested by every fresh addition to our positive knowledge."

To this paradoxical statement he appends the very apposite question, "How is it possible to reconcile these two opposites?" His chapter on "The practical synthesis of contradictories"—one of the most remarkable in the book—affords an answer. It will repay a detailed examination if only for the reason that it gives us the key to Mr. Mallock's thought. It opens with the admission that from the fact that God is "incomprehensible," it follows that our ideas concerning Him contain manifest contradictions. But this is also true of other objects of knowledge. The prophets of Monism are guilty of manifold contradictions in their scientific system. As a crucial example we have the theory of ether, which has taken the place of that of bodies separated from each other by space. That discovery was thought at first to explain how one mass of matter can attract another mass, but it is now seen only to give rise to increasing perplexities. "The difficulties," says the author, "which inhere in the theistic conception of God, and those which inhere in the scientific conception of ether [*e. g.*, the expansion and contraction of a continuous body, the resolution of a simple body into a specific complexity], are for the mere intellect practically one and the same." On similar grounds it is shown that *all* scientific knowledge, when analyzed sufficiently, ends in paradoxes and incomprehensibility, yet for all practical purposes we accept the conclusions of science, ignoring the preliminary contradictions. "Nobody doubts the reality of time . . . because his intellect refuses to grasp the idea of eternity," nor the reality of space, because his intellect refuses to grasp the idea of infinity. The conclusion is thus stated: "If every synthesis which we make in picturing the world as real involves, when submitted to analysis, contradictions which cannot be reconciled, and if nevertheless our belief in the reality of the world continues, it is perfectly obvious that there can be no *a priori* reason why we should not believe in the reality of the religious synthesis, though the principle of freedom which it obliges us to assert appears to our intellect incompatible with the determinism which we are unable to deny." In fine, Mr. Mallock's position is based on an *argumentum ad hominem.* If we are compelled to "supplement our belief in science by other beliefs which contradict the first principles of science;" if as strong a 'fundamental difficulty' confronts the teaching of science and ethics

as religious dogma; then there is no intellectual necessity laid upon us of abandoning the primary doctrines of faith because they seem to involve us in unthinkable or even contradictory conclusions. As with science so with religion: "the intellectual compatibility of propositions is no test of their truth."[4] What is that test? In answering this question Mr. Mallock arrives at the second and constructive part of his argument.

His negative argument is not dissimilar to that originally framed by Bishop Butler, and modernized by Mr. A. J. Balfour in his "Foundations of Belief." It may be summed up in the phrase that logically there is no alternative between universal scepticism [*e. g.*, as regards the testing of science on the impenetrability of matter no less than that of theology or moral freedom] and Theism.

Not only, however, is religion not irrational; there are "weightiest and most definite reasons" for accepting it. These are supplied by Mr. Mallock under the title of "Practical Bases of Belief." He is here hardly so ingenious in dialectic or brilliant in exposition as in the first part of his book. Nevertheless, his argument is forcible and should appeal to the modern sceptical mind. Briefly, it is on the following lines: Religion bases its validity on its power to satisfy man's sorest and deepest needs. Defenders of Monism, like Huxley and Spencer,[5] as we have seen at an earlier period, show the weakness of their position by the shifts to which they are reduced in their sorry

[4] Towards the end of his treatise Mr. Mallock enunciates the same principle thus: "If religion, in the face of modern knowledge, is ever to be established on a firm intellectual basis, this result must be brought about by a recognition of the truth that the existence of nothing in its totality can ever be grasped by the intellect. . . . Let us only get rid of this utterly false idea that no two beliefs can be true which the intellect is unable to reconcile; and we shall then with equal confidence be able to accept both. We must learn with regard to the deeper things of life, that the fact of our adopting a creed which involves an assent to contradictories is not a sign that our creed is useless or absurd, but that the ultimate nature of things is for our minds inscrutable." It will be seen that the philosophical basis of the argument is substantially the same as that outlined by Kant in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, and developed in his "Critique of Practical Reason."

[5] Mr. Mallock declares Mr. H. Spencer's Monism to be a practical "re-introduction of Theism, called by another name, and deprived of its logical coherency, so that it falls to pieces at a touch, like a watch without its screws." It should be noted that even the rationalist Hæckel admits in his *Glaubensbekentniss* that the morality of the Monistic Natural Creed "nowise contradicts the good and truly precious part of the Christian ethics." (*Cf.* his *Monismus als Band zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft.*)

makeshifts for the Personal God, judging the immortal soul for its use of its moral freedom, of Theism. We think that Mr. Mallock might have shown conveniently at this point that the doctrine of Monism itself, when properly understood, leads to Theism. In the words of a recent writer in the *Fortnightly Review:* "Either one must believe the universe to be one and systematic, and held together by some omnipresent quality, or one must believe it to be a casual aggregation, an incoherent accumulation, with no unity whatsoever outside the unity of the personality regarding it. All science and most modern religious systems presuppose the former and to believe [it] is to anyone not anxious to quibble, to believe in God." (December, 1901, p. 1064.)

Religion, moreover, is beneficial to the race generally. Without its teaching, civilization based on right ethics, which, in their turn, involve the axioms of Theism, would be on the wane. "It is essential to, and implied in, the entire development and exercise of the higher faculties generally." In his concluding chapter on "The Reasonable Liberation of Belief" the author develops this line of thought by an appeal to universal experience in support of his contention that religious belief satisfies a deep-seated need of human nature, is supremely necessary for man's moral perfection as a member of society, and is as reasonable as our assent to "the reality of the cosmic world." On these grounds, therefore, first, because "no logical substitute for theism can be devised; secondly (because), the substitutes such as they are (the reference is to the philosophy of H. Spencer and Huxley) are no less inconsistent than theism is, with the universe as science reveals it to us; and thirdly (because), religion . . . claims its place as an element in life, not only (inasmuch as) it ministers to and interprets the special aspirations and emotions which we commonly call religion, . . . but also because it is essential to the development of the higher human faculties;" for these reasons Mr. Mallock concludes, we are justified in affirming the truth of the primary doctrines of religion, although we know that we cannot ourselves by any intellectual device reconcile them with the truths of science, which at the same time we accept also. Thus it is that he exhibits Theism as "a system worthy of general acceptance."

The treatise affords abundant food for thought. It should take its rank beside Mr. Balfour's "Foundations of Belief" as a luminous survey, from a severely intellectual standpoint, of the reasonableness of the basis of religion, well-calculated to make the captious sceptic pause and to allay the fears of the honest doubter.

Our chief complaint against it is its wanton iconoclasm. Mr. Mallock positively revels in paradox; he pulls down with one hand what he essays to build up with the other. Especially in his remarks on free-will (which form the nucleus of his work) he makes no disguise of his contempt for every argument in its favor. For ourselves we confess that he appears to us to take shelter behind ridicule instead of meeting squarely in the open the late Dr. W. G. Ward's assault on Determinism—an assault which so doughty a champion as John Stuart Mill declared to be the most serious made. He has really no satisfactory answer to make to Dr. Ward's appeal to the universal experience of the possession of the power of choice in the moment of mental decision. He contents himself with the cheap sneer that Dr. Ward attempting to meet the objections of the Determinist school, is like someone "running from a train which, before he has gone a yard, overtakes him and knocks him down." We miss in the book the cautiousness, the restraint, the moderation, the scrupulous fairness towards opponents, that were such marked characteristics of Mr. Balfour's monumental work. It will be impossible to find in the pages of the latter such levity of tone and irresponsibility of statement as occur on pp. 115, 140, 141 of the present book. It may please Mr. Mallock's wit to include beer and mutton chops in his larder of metaphor; it certainly does not enhance the seriousness and weight of his arguments. We regret these lapses from good taste the more because they are calculated to give the impression that the author is a *dilettante*, a trifler, a chopper of logic, taking only an academic interest in his subject. The book contains so much thoughtful matter, so many shrewd thrusts at fallacies of the market-place, so subtle a defence of the fundamental postulates of Theism, that we wish it a better fate than we fear its blemishes will allow it to receive. W. R. C.

EPISTOLAE ET EVANGELIA Totius Anni Secundum Missale Romanum S. Pii V. Pont. Max. jussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII, et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Cum Approbatione S. Rituum Congregationis. Editio Tertia. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Sumptibus et Typis Friderici Pustet. S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rit Congreg. Typographi. 1903. Pp. 236—76—16.

For the solemn services in our cathedrals and parish churches this handsome volume supplies a most desirable adjunct. Instead of the heavy missal from which the deacon and subdeacon are ordinarily obliged to chant the Gospel and Epistle at Solemn Mass, we have here

a slender volume, beautifully printed and tastefully bound, which the sacred minister can hold without being fatigued and which renders easy the opening and graceful carrying about of the same during the functions· The collection has all the Epistles and Gospels belonging to the latest revision of the missal, and includes the *Propria* for the United States and South America.

THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY. By Edwin R. A. Seligman, Professor of Political Economy and Finance, Columbia University, New York. New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Company, Agents. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1902. Pp. 166.

THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL MOTION. By Michael A. Lane. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1902. Pp. 577.

The thesis formulated and defended by Professor Seligman runs thus: Since man's existence depends on his ability to sustain himself, the economic life is the fundamental condition of all life. Human life being, however, normally social, individual existence moves within the framework of the social structure and is modified by it. What the conditions of maintenance are to the individual, the similar relations of production and consumption are to the community. To economic causes, therefore, must be traced in last instance those transformations in the structure of society which themselves condition the relations of social classes and the various manifestations of social life. The doctrine herein summarized has been sometimes called "historical materialism," or the "materialistic interpretation of history." "Economic determinism" is also one of its titles. In so far, however, as these appellations are meant to be exclusive of all moral and consequently free agencies working in the development of social institutions, they are inexact and misleading. The economic interpretation of history is preferred by the author as indicating that economic activity has been the preponderating factor in shaping and developing all human society.

The theory is, of course, not a new one. Traces of it may be found as far back as the middle of the seventeenth century; for does not Harrington observe in his *Oceana*, "such as is the proportion or balance of dominion or property in Land, such is the nature of the Empire"? In its more fully recognized content and bearings, however, its promulgation must be attributed to Marx. In the third volume of *Das Kapital*

he writes: "It is always the immediate relation of the owner of the conditions of production to the immediate producers . . . in which we find the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and thus also of the political forms." One does not commit oneself to the idealistico-materialistic philosophy of Marx, much less to his socialistic doctrines, when one accords to the author of *Das Kapital* the credit of seeing more deeply than had his predecessors into the influence of economic forces in the progress of history.

Professor Seligman, in the present small volume, made up, by the way, of articles which he had contributed to the *Political Science Quarterly*, traces the history of the theory, and replies to the criticism that has been brought against it. The latter portion of the work is especially interesting and satisfying,—not least for the calm, conservative temper of the discussion. Though the defence is firm and urgent, there is a prevailing sense of moderation as well as avoidance on the whole of an exaggerated extension of the theory, to the exclusion of the moral and spiritual influences that have produced and developed social and political institutions.

There are, however, some opinions of the author with which the Catholic reader finds himself at variance; for instance, this: that the conception of crimes and torts—offences against society and indviduals—preceded the conception of sin, or offence against God or the moral law, reflected in conscience. The oldest and most reliable truly historical record that we possess, to say nothing of the universal traditions of the race, points to an offence against the Deity as the first sin. On philosophical grounds moreover—psychological and ethical—we must express dissent from the following: "The reason why it is not safe, categorically, to deny the existenc of morality among animals is that the older contention of an essential psychical difference between man and animals has broken down before the flood of recent investigation. Coöperative biology has proved that psychological phenomena begin far down in animal life. Some writers profess to find them among the very lowest classes of beings, so low, indeed, that it is even doubtful whether they belong to the animal or to the vegetable kingdom" (p. 114).

This we must characterize as a perfectly gratuitous assertion. There is not the slightest evidence for this "flood of recent investigation that has broken down the older contention of an essential psychical difference between man and animals;" on the contrary, the whole flood of recent investigation moves in the opposite direction and confirms the older contention. Coöperative biology has *proved*, we prefer to say, what observation reveals, viz., that psychological phenomena of a *lower degree* began far down in animal life, in the amœba, the monera. On the other hand, the psychological phenomena of the *highest degree*,

manifested in the abstractive and reflective processes of intellect and the elective power of will, are man's specific endowments which he shares with no being of the purely animal kingdom.

On the whole, what we find commendable in the book is its presentation of the proximate reasons for the thesis. When the argument moves on philosophical grounds it displays the gratuitousness and the weakness inherent in materialistic evolutionism.

In the *Level of Social Motion* Mr. Lane maintains a thesis substantially identical with that defended by Professor Seligman. Whilst the latter, however, interprets the past in the light of his theory, the former is more concerned with the future. The one is historical, the other prophetic. The cosmical and biological forces, of which the economic are supposed to be but a specialized form, are gradually but certainly carrying the human race onward to a state of equilibrium in which the sum of social product will be equally divided among those who produce it. The general diffusion of wealth and education will, moreover, result in a permanent equalization of population. The author brings some acute observations from experience, economics and biology to bear on his conclusions, but they are so overgrown by exaggerated statements and unwarranted influences and so entangled in a radically erroneous psychology that their effectiveness is practically choked. A few citations will suffice to introduce the reader to the author's psychology. "The subject-matter of psychology," he says, "is the brain and the nerves with their functions" (p. 424). Operations within the brain itself take place by means of certain movements among the ganglion cells, and this process is called intellection (*ib.*). "Psycho-physicists work on the assumption that all the obscure phenomena of mind could be explained if the cellular action of the brain were once completely understood. Many of the simpler operations of thought are equally accounted for in this way; and many of the more complex phenomena of the mind are found, upon closer examination, to be due altogether to the same cause. Consciousness itself is held to be only the sum of ganglion action, and while this view is not the popular one, nobody has been able to aduce a single fact in its contradiction" (p. 425). Further on we are told that "experiment has proved that thought is nothing but nervous action highly compounded," and "that mental action, like physical or vital action, is purely mechanical." What most strongly impresses the reader is the ease with which scientific and philosophical problems that theretofore have baffled the deepest minds are solved in these pages. Thus he finds that whilst "we do not know the nature of nervous force—it is none the less true that we *do* know the method by which nervous force acts; and in that method there is no mystery at all." Once more, "the uncultured person sees mystery in the phenomena of his own consciousness simply because he does not understand the action going on in his brain. He knows nothing of cellular physiology or of ganglion structure—" (p. 429). The author's self-confidence is truly colossal.

Literary Chat.

Few literary projects have been undertaken of late years which promise to equal in thoroughness the announced publication of the *History of the Philippine Islands* by the Clark Company (Cleveland, O.). The available material, which has been carefully gone over by the principal editors, Professor James Alexander Robertson and Miss Emma H. Blair (of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin), embraces an immense store of manuscripts, charts, and designs, including valuable documents from the archives of Madrid, Simaucas, Seville, mostly hitherto unpublished; these have been collated with originals in other national libraries. It is conjectured that the work will be completed in fifty-five volumes, to be issued by subscription, the number of copies to be limited to a thousand sets.

The Clergy will be glad to be reminded that the Ratisbon firm of Fr. Pustet has published four excellent manuals containing separately the Offices of the Passion of Holy Week (from Palm Sunday until Whit Sunday), of Pentecost week, and of Corpus Christi with the Office of the Sacred Heart. These little volumes, which have also the Mass service for each of the seasons of the respective feasts, are beautifully printed and neatly bound in flexible covers, to suit their special purpose as serving as a handy synopsis of the Breviary during festive seasons.

The *American College* at Louvain (Belgium) is making spirited progress not only in matters of cultivating the missionary zeal which has been transmitted to its students as a sacred trust by a noble band of priestly models, but also in developing a zest for literary activity. The first number of the Louvain *American College Bulletin* tells how the magazine originated in the desire to create a continuous and tangible bond between the alumni in all parts of the United States, and the Alma Mater with its corps of levites still in training. The old students will thus be kept informed of the progress of their College, and the publication will serve as a fitting reminder of the high aims which the members of an institution, destined to fashion heroic souls, are bound to maintain by their allegiance to the principles of its foundation. The opportunities offered to American students who go to European colleges, however great from the viewpoint of special intellectual culture, are not necessarily an advantage to the young priest. Study may beget nothing more than knowledge accompanied by a sense of self-sufficiency which ends in inactivity at an age wherein the best work of a well informed man should be done for others. To make foreign culture of real service for the student of theology or letters there must be fostered with it the spirit of practical utility, the habit of looking upon study as instrumental to the further acquisition and extension of the Kingdom of Christ, the spirit of generous coöperation in any work that makes for the popularizing of truth and charity. This practical view has, it seems to us, been the spirit characteristic of the College at Louvain. It speaks out of the activity of many of the men trained there during the last decades, who in every part of the United States are given to arduous labor, missionary and intellectual, in spheres which suggest little prospect of cultured ease or preferment. There must be upwards of four hundred priests on our missions who have been trained in the American College at Louvain, most of them in the West and Southwest, having the care of widely scattered congregations. To these a monthly word from their Alma Mater through a publication like the *Bulletin*

will prove an added measure of strength and joy; and it is likely to produce a still ampler growth of men who, to ability and love for the mission work, join a taste for reading and study by which they fill out profitably their hours of temporary rest from pastoral labor. THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW has been, we understand, a favorite at the Belgian College, and, indeed, with the Louvain priests generally. from its beginning. Hence we feel a kind of family interest in the success of the Bulletin.

There is unusual activity of late in our Catholic educational field. We are getting pedagogical literature from the Catholic point of view. Since the efforts made to extend and perpetuate the Public-School system, which eliminates all definite religious teaching from the curriculum, have warned us that we are soon to face an agnostic or atheistic condition of national society, attempts have been made to give teachers a periodical representing Catholic principles of education. The late Mr. Montgomery, an ardent champion of religious education and of the right of parents to secure it for their children, undertook to maintain, single-handed, a monthly, with the title of "Family Defender." Its attitude was, in the main, polemical. It proposed to inaugurate and keep alive, until victory were attained, a continuous warfare against the policy of irreligious State schools supported by common taxation without adequate representation of the parents. It maintained that, if one-third of the population which was taxed to provide a common education for the children of the land were dissatisfied with the education imparted, they had a right to have a remedy applied which was just to all. It proved that a fair division of the taxes for this purpose was quite as feasible as a system of local option in other spheres of municipal or State rule. Mr. Montgomery showed not only that the public system, as carried on, implied a flagrant violation of the parental right, but he also pointed out other defects resulting from our State patronage in education. Catholics clapped their hands at Mr. Montgomery's courage, but they waited to see whether he would win without other active coöperation. Thus he failed; and his enterprise remains a monument to his nobility of character, and to the supineness of his fellows.

But Catholics continued to have evidence that if they would secure proper education for the next generation they must build their own schools wherever possible. Rome urged the matter, and under a unified discipline Parochial Schools were built in all parts of the country. With the growth of the Parochial Schools, and a greater attention to method in the Sunday-school in places where a parish school was impracticable for the time being, further efforts were made to supply literary help in monthly publications, among which may be mentioned as entirely devoted to the subject, *The School Journal*, published by the late Rector of our Catholic University, then a parish priest in New England. The most notable effort in this direction, however, came with the establishment of the Summer School, and *Mosher's Magazine* as a special organ for our Catholic teachers. Mr. Mosher made a valiant struggle, and there is no doubt that his work, like that of Mr. Montgomery, will be better appreciated some future day, when it will be more evident that he paved the way for others who will follow with more apparent success in the same difficult field.

But *Mosher's Magazine* has recently left the narrow path of a strictly pedagogical medium, and turned into the wider path of general Catholic literature, though

not without retaining a decided partiality for its former scope and work. In the meantime the Northwest has become alive to the needs of the hour, and as a result *The Catholic School Journal* issued not long ago from Milwaukee. It shows in all its numbers a lively attention to current educational topics, is full of interesting opinions from experienced teachers, and seeks apparently to minister to the popular element among Catholic educators.

If *The Catholic School Journal* falls in any sense short in dealing with the graver problems of education, the demand is likely to be supplied by the most recent champion of Catholic education, *The Review of Catholic Pedagogy*, issued from Chicago. We are averse to praising an enterprise such as this before it has approved itself, but we are free to say that the first two numbers give one an excellent impression of the new magazine's purpose and ability. The form too in which it offers itself to Catholic teachers is respectable and in line with the advance made in this direction by our religious magazines generally of late years. Catholic publicists who are in quest of revenue by ministering to the religious needs of their fellows, are apt to neglect the finer sense of making externals harmonize with the high purpose of spiritual teaching; and as a consequence the estimate of Catholic literature itself has been lowered, so that persons of taste look upon any work which bears the trade-mark of religion with suspicion. *The Review of Catholic Pedagogy* is as well printed and furnished as it is edited, and gives good promise of its growth and efficiency.

By a happy coincidence the *Mangalore* (*India*) *Magazine*, commenting upon Dr. Henry's version of the Holy Father's poems published by us, selects the stanza which the translator has taken for his keynote of the beautiful Jubilee expression appearing in the present issue of THE DOLPHIN, and remarks that these lines "have often been translated, but perhaps never so felicitously."

We may borrow from the March DOLPHIN'S illuminated frontispiece on the occasion of the Papal Jubilee the following elegant lines, suggested to their author by the portrait of the Holy Father;

"Sun-wrought with magic of the skies,
The image fair before me lies:
Deep-vaulted brow and sparkling eyes
And lip's fine chiseling.

"Yet have the Years of Peter caught
A subtler art, a grander thought,
And in thy face the glory wrought
Of Father and of King."

The Leader is the new name given to *The Young Catholic* published by the Paulist Fathers for young people. The magazine will be issued monthly instead of fortnightly as hitherto.

The article on *The Father's Right to Educate*, appearing in the current issue of THE DOLPHIN, deserves to be widely read for its solid and clearly developed doctrine. We need hardly recall the fact that the writer of it, Father William Humphrey, S.J., is the author of numerous works, among which will be best remembered, aside of his famous digest of Suarez' work on the Religious State, the volumes entitled "The Divine Teacher" and "The One Mediator."

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

EPISTOLAE ET EVANGELIA totius anni secundum Missale Romanum S. Pii V. Pont. Max. jussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII, et Leonis XIII auctoritate recognitum. Cum Approbatione S. Rituum Congregationis. Editio Tertia. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Sumpt. et Typis Friderici Pustet. S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rituum Congreg. Typographi. 1903. Pp. 328. Price, $10.80. Red morocco, richly gilt.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS FUNDAMENTALIS. Auctore Thoma Jos. Bouquillon, S.T.D., et in universitate Catholica Americana Theologiae moralis Professore. Editio recognita et adaucta. Brugis, Car. Beyaert, Editor, 1903. Parisiis: P. Lethielleux. Romae, Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet. Pp. 743. Pretium, $3.25 *net.*

OFFICIA PROPRIA MYSTERIORUM ET INSTRUMENTORUM PASSIONIS D. N. J. C. Juxta Breviarium Romanum. Cum Psalmis et Precibus in Extenso. Cum Approbatione Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis. Ratisbonae, Romae et Neo-Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Friderici Pustet. MDCCCIC. Pp. 156. Pretium, $0.75 *net.*

OFFICIUM IN FESTO PENTECOSTES et per totam Octavam, secundum Missale et Breviarium Romanum. Ratisbonae, Romae et Neo Eboraci: Sumptibus et Typis Friderici Pustet. MCMI. Pp. 112. Pretium, $0.65 *net.*

MEDITATIONS ON THE PASSION OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER. Comprising each scene from the Washing of the Disciples' Feet to the Death upon the Cross. Part I. By the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. London and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1903. Pp. ix—219. Price, $1.00 *net.*

THEOLOGIA, or the Doctrine of God. Outline Notes Based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, etc. Chicago, Toronto, New York: Fleming R. Revell & Co. 1903. Pp. viii—143. Price, $0.75 *net.*

HAPPINESS. Essays on the Meaning of Life. By Carl Hilty, Professor of Constitutional Law, University of Bern. Translated by Francis Greenwood Peabody, Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University, Cambridge. New York: Macmillan and Company; London: The Macmillan Company, Ltd. 1903. Pp. x—154. Price, $1.25 *net.*

EVANGELIUM DER BARMHERZIGKEIT. Fastenpredigten von P. Melchior Lechner, O. Fr. M., Lect. theol. Innsbruck: Felician Rauch. 1903. (New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.) Pp. 88 broch. Price, 25 cents.

WER IST CHRISTUS? Sechs Fastenpredigten von P. Melchior Lechner, O. Fr. M., Lect. theol. Innsbruck: Felician Rauch. 1903. (New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.) Pp. 103 broch. Price, 25 cents.

HAIL! FULL OF GRACE. Simple Thoughts on the Rosary. By Mother Mary Loyola. Edited by Father Thurston, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. xiii—261. Price, $1.35 *net.*

BEYOND THE GRAVE. From the French of Rev. E. Hamon, S.J. By Anna T. Sadlier. Second Edition. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. viii—300. Price, $1.00 *net.*

IN HOLIEST TROTH. The Story of St. Encratida, one of the Martyrs of Saragossa, A. D. 304. By Sister Mary Fidelis, author of *Growth in the Knowledge of Our Lord*, etc. London: Burns & Oates (New York: Benziger Brothers). 1902. Pp. 208.

THE ART OF LIFE. An Essay. By Frederic Charles Kolbe, D.D., of St. Mary's, Capetown. The Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. (Dublin: Sealy, Byers & Walker.) New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 109. Price, 75 cents.

HISTORY.

ROME AND REFORM. By T. L. Kington Oliphant, of Balliol College. In two volumes. London: Macmillan & Co. (New York: The Macmillan Company.). 1902. Pp. 541 and 548. Price, $7.00 *net.*

THE TRUTH OF PAPAL CLAIMS. By Raphael Merry Del Val, D.D., Archbishop of Nicæa. A Reply to the Validity of Papal Claims by F. Nutcombe Oxenham, D.D., English Chaplain in Rome. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Sands & Co. 1902. Pp. xvi—129—xv. Price, $1.00 *net.*

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY in Maryland and Rhode Island. By Rev. Lucian Johnson. Brooklyn and New York: International Catholic Truth Society. Pp. 56.

THE DISCOVERIES OF THE NORSEMEN IN AMERICA. With special relation to their early ethnographical representation. By Joseph Fischer, S.J., Professor of Geography, Jesuit College, Feldkirch. Translated from the German by Basil H. Soulsby, B.A. British Museum. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. (London: Henry Stevens, Son & Stiles.) 1903. Pp. 131. Illustrations and Maps. Price, $2.00.

BELLES-LETTRES.

TENNYSON'S GARETH AND LYNETTE, LANCELOT AND ELAINE, AND THE PASSING OF ARTHUR. Edited with Notes and Introduction by Sophie Chantal Hart, M.A., Associate Professor of Rhetoric in Wellesley College. New York, London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1903. Pp. xxxii—127. Price, $0.50.

IRVING'S OLIVER GOLDSMITH. Edited with Notes and an Introduction by Lewis B. Semple, Ph.D., Teacher of English in the Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. New York, London and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1903. Pp. xxiii—296. Price, $0.50.

THE ROSE AND THE SHEEPSKIN. By Joseph Gordian Daley, author of *A Cassock of the Pines.* New York: Wm. H. Young and Co. 1902. Pp. vi—389. Price, $1.00.

THE ART OF DISAPPEARING. By John Talbot Smith, author of *Saranac, His Honor the Mayor*, etc. New York City: William H. Young and Co. 1902. Pp. iv—367. Price, $1.50.

SIR WALTER SCOTT'S THE LADY OF THE LAKE. Edited with Notes and an Introduction by George Rice Carpenter, Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia University. New York, London, Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1903. Pp. xxiv—191.

A ROYAL SON AND MOTHER. By the Baroness Pauline von Hügel. Notre Dame, Indiana: *The Ave Maria.* Loretto Press. Pp. 127. Price, $0.75.

THE TALISMAN. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 186. Price, $0.60.

THE PILKINGTON HEIR. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 212. Price, $1.25.

MISCELLANEOUS.

GENERAL VERSAMMLUNG (Sieben und Vierzigste) des Deutschen R. Katholischen Central-Vereins der Ver. Staaten von Nord Amerika, abgehalten in Evansville, Ind., 21 25 Sept., 1902. Milwaukee, Wis.: Excelsior Publishing Company. 1902. Pp. 184.

LE CANADA ECCLESIASTIQUE. Almanach Annuaire du Clergé Canadien. Publié par La Cie Cadieux et Derome. Pour l'année 1903. (17me.) Librairie Saint Joseph, 1666 Rue Notre Dame, Montreal. Pp. 334.

OFFICIAL CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, ALMANAC AND CLERGY LIST, for the year of our Lord 1903. Containing complete reports of all Dioceses in the United States, Canada, Newfoundland, Great Britain and Ireland, etc. Vol. XVIII. No. 1. Milwaukee, Wis.: The M. H. Wiltzius Company. Pp. 888–180–207. Price, $1.25.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—APRIL, 1903.—NO. 4

VOTIVE MASSES.

PART I.

SOLEMN AND PRIVATE.

1.—A *Votive Mass*, in the strict and proper meaning of the word, is that which is not prescribed by the rubrics, and does not correspond with the Office recited by the celebrant on any individual day according to the *Ordo* or *Kalendarium* which he follows.[1] Hence Masses which are celebrated in conformity with the *Officia Votiva per Annum*, granted by Apostolic Indult, July 5, 1883,[2] or the Mass in honor of the Blessed Virgin, prescribed by the rubrics on Saturdays of Advent,[3] and the Masses of Ferials and Vigils occurring within octaves, which must be celebrated in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches besides the prescribed Mass of the feast,[4] are not, strictly speaking, *Votive Masses.*

2.—Votive Masses are divided—

A. On account of their intrinsic solemnity (*ratione solemnitatis intrinsecae*) into:

I. Solemn Masses;
II. Private Masses;
III. Privileged Masses.

B. On account of the subject (*ratione objecti*) into:

[1] According to this definition *Requiem* Masses are also votive, but since they are governed by special rules (See THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, November, 1902) they are here excluded.

[2] S.R.C. Urbis et Orbis, 3581.

[3] Rubr. Gen. Miss. Rom., Tit. iv, 2.

[4] Schober, *S. Alphonsi Liber de Caerem. Missae*, App. iii, n. 2.

I. Masses of Saints and Mysteries whose feasts are celebrated during the year;

II. Masses found at the end of the Missal after the *Commune Sanctorum;*

III. Masses for Various Purposes.

3.—The distinction of *private* and *solemn* votive Masses does not depend on the *external* or *extrinsic* solemnity with which they are celebrated, *i. e.*, they are not *solemn* because they are celebrated with the assistance of a Deacon and a Subdeacon or in chant, nor are they *private* because they are read only, or are *low* Masses, but it depends on their *intrinsic* solemnity. Hence a *private* votive Mass may be celebrated with the assistance of Deacon and Subdeacon, or may be a *missa cantata.*

I.—Solemn Votive Masses.

4.—A *solemn* votive Mass is that which is celebrated

1°. For a *grave cause* or *public need of the Church.* Such would be some spiritual or temporal need which affects the whole community, or at least the greater part of it, *e.g.*, for obtaining a great favor: peace, rain, clear weather, recovery of the health of the Roman Pontiff, Bishop, secular Prince, election of a Pope, Diocesan Bishop, etc.;[5] for averting some great calamity: war, contagious disease, unusual mortality;[6] for returning thanks for some significant favor or blessing.[7]

2°. *With external solemnity, i. e.*, with deacon and subdeacon, if in any manner it is possible, or at least in chant.[8]

3°. *Prescribed* or *at least permitted by the Ordinary:* Roman Pontiff, Bishop of the Diocese or some authoritative person or persons acting in place of the Ordinary. If a grave and public cause for a solemn votive Mass should exist in any city, town, district or parish, *e.g.*, contagious disease, permission for it must be obtained from the Ordinary.[9]

[5] S.R.C., May 19, 1607, n. 235, ad. 12; Appeltern, *Man. Lit.*, vol. i, p. 139.

[6] Van der Stappen, *De Rubr. Miss. Rom.*, Quaest. 206, 1°; De Herdt, *S. Lit. Praxis*, vol. i, n. 27.

[7] *Ibidem.*

[8] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. ix, 14 and Tit. xii, 4; De Herdt, vol. i, n. 29.

[9] Van der Stappen. *Ibidem*, Quaest. 207, 3°.

Note.—(*a*) The election of an Abbess;[10]

(*b*) the reception or profession of Religious;[11]

(*c*) the first Mass or the Golden Jubilee of a priest;[12]

(*d*) the solemn procession in honor of the Blessed Sacrament;[13]

(*e*) a Novena;[14]

(*f*) the titular feasts of sodalities and confraternities;[15] and many other similar causes—are not considered important enough to allow a *solemn votive Mass.*

5.—The solemn votive Mass is permitted every day of the year, Sundays included, except on

1°. Feasts, *Dupl. 1 classis;*

2°. The privileged Sundays—I. Advent, I. Lent, Passion, Palm, Easter, *in Albis*, Pentecost, and Trinity;

3°. Ash-Wednesday and during Holy Week;

4°. The Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost;[16]

5°. The days on which the Office of the saint or mystery, in whose honor the votive Mass is to be celebrated, is recited, whether *ratione festi aut octavae.*[17]

6.—If a solemn votive Mass is to be celebrated on the days noted above (**5**, 1°, 2°, 3°, 4°, 5°), the Mass of the day is taken in its entirety, and the oration of the votive Mass is added to the principal oration *sub una conclusione*,[18] and the other occurring orations are subjoined *sub distincta conclusione.*[19]

Example.—The Ordinary prescribes a solemn votive Mass in honor of the Holy Ghost on August 28th. That day would be the Titular Feast of Church of St. Augustine, which in that church is a *duplex primae classis.* In the Church of St. Augustine the Mass of this Saint must be taken in its entirety, and the oration of the

[10] S.R.C., April 28, 1708, n. 2184, ad 5.

[11] S.R.C., July 24, 1683, n. 1714, ad 5.

[12] Schober, *Ibidem*, App. iii; c. I, A. 2.

[13] S.R.C., May 8, 1749, n. 2402; Sept. 10, 1796, n. 2552, ad 4; Dec. 6, 1653, n. 954.

[14] S.R.C., Sept. 2, 1690, n. 1843, ad 5 et 6.

[15] S.R.C., Sept. 23, 1837, n. 2769, ad 8.

[16] S.R.C., June 30, 1896, n. 3922, § ii, 2.

[17] S.R.C., Jan. 26, 1793, n. 2542, ad 2.

[18] S.R.C., June 30, 1896, n. 3922, § ii, 2.

[19] De Herdt, *Ibidem*, vol. i, n. 29; Schober, *Ibidem*, App. iii, c. i, B.

Holy Ghost must be added to that of St. Augustine *sub una conclusione.*

7.—In a solemn votive Mass the following must be observed:

1°. The *Gloria in excelsis* is always sung,[20] except when *violet* vestments are used.[21]

2°. Only one oration is sung.[22] Every commemoration, even of a Sunday, Major Ferial, etc., although only one Mass is celebrated in the church,[23] is omitted, except when the votive Mass is celebrated in presence of the Most Blessed Sacrament exposed, or when it is a Mass of thanksgiving;[24] for then the oration *de SS. Sacramento*, or *Deus misericordiae*, respectively, is added to the oration of the Mass *sub unica conclusione.*[25]

3°. The *Sequence* is always omitted.[26]

4°. The *Credo* is always sung, even if the Mass is in honor of a saint on whose feast day it is not recited in Mass.[27] It is, however, not sung in votive Masses celebrated in *violet* vestments,[28] except on Sundays.[29]

5°. With regard to the *Preface:* (*a*) If the votive Mass has its *proper* Preface, it must be recited, although the votive Mass is sung within an octave which has its proper Preface; (*b*) If the votive Mass has *not* a *proper* Preface, but is celebrated within an octave having a proper Preface, the latter must be recited; (*c*) If the votive Mass has no proper Preface, but within an ecclesiastical cycle which has a proper Preface (Lent, Passiontide, etc.), then the Preface of the cycle is recited; (*d*) If no proper Preface is prescribed, then the *communis* is recited,[30] except on Sundays

[20] S.R.C., June 30, 1896, n. 3922, § ii, 3.

[21] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. viii, 4.

[22] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. ix, 14.

[23] S.R.C., Jan. 29, 1752, n. 2417, ad 7.

[24] For a Mass of Thanksgiving the Mass *de Trinitate*, or *de Spiritu Sancto*, or *de Beata Maria* is taken.

[25] S.R.C., June 23, 1736, n. 2323, ad 1. Rubr. Spec. Miss. placed before the Missa Votiva *pro Gratiarum actione.*

[26] S.R.C., Sept. 16, 1673, n. 1490, ad 2; March 21, 1795, n. 2550, ad 2.

[27] S.R.C., Aug. 13, 1667, n. 1357, ad 3.

[28] S.R.C., Feb. 13, 1666, n. 1333, ad 4.

[29] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. xi.

[30] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. xiii, 4.

when the Preface *de Trinitate* must be sung.[31] These rules concerning the Preface are applicable to all votive Masses.

Note.—No attention is to be paid to the Preface which would be recited if the Mass were celebrated *conformis officio diei.*

Example.—If on Thursday the office *de SS. Sacramento* is recited and the Mass of the Most Blessed Sacrament were celebrated, the Preface would be *de Nativitate.* But if on that day a solemn Mass were sung in honor of St. Augustine, the Preface in this Mass would be the *communis.*

6°. During the octave of the Feast of the Ascension there is a proper *Communicantes* in the Canon of the Mass.[32] This special *communicantes* is recited in all solemn votive Masses, celebrated during this octave even if the special Preface of the octave is not recited.[33]

Example.—If a solemn votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin is celebrated during this octave, the Preface will be *de B. Maria Virg.*, but the *Communicantes* will be the *proprium de Ascensione.*

7°. *Ite Missa est* is sung as often as the *Gloria in excelsis* is prescribed but *Benedicamus Domino*, when *Gloria in excelsis* is omitted.[34]

8°. The Gospel of St. John *In principio* is invariably recited at the end of a votive Mass, although it be celebrated on a Sunday, Vigil, or Ferial, which has a proper gospel.[35]

8.—In the rubrics of Passiontide it is prescribed that the Ps. *Judica* before the *Confiteor* and the *Gloria Patri* at the Introit and after the *Lavabo* be omitted. This is, however, not the case in votive Masses, even if the Mass *de Cruce* or *de Passione* be celebrated.[36]

9.—In solemn votive Masses the *color* of the vestments and the ornaments of the altar must be the same, with few exceptions, as that used on the feast itself.[37]

[31] *Ibidem*, 5.

[32] During the other octaves having a proper *Communicantes* and *Te igitur* no solemn votive Mass is allowed to be sung.

[33] S.R.C., June 16, 1663, n. 1265, ad 3.

[34] Rubr. Gen. Miss., § xiii, 1.

[35] *Ibidem*, 2.

[36] De Herdt, vol. iii, n. 21, II; Van der Stappen, Quaest. 241.

[37] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. xviii, 2 and 3; S.R.C., Aug. 13, 1667, n. 1357, ad 3.

A. In Masses of the Saints:

1°. *White*—Blessed Virgin, Confessors, Virgins;

2°. *Red*—Apostles[38] and Martyrs.[39]

B. In Masses of the Mysteries:

1°. *White*—Most Holy Trinity, Angels, M. B. Sacrament, Holy Name, Sacred Heart;

2°. *Red*—Holy Ghost, Cross, Precious Blood, Instruments of the Passion;[40]

3°. *Violet*—Passion.[41]

C. In Masses for Various Purposes:

1°. *Red*—Election of a Roman Pontiff;

2°. *Violet*—*Pro quacumque necessitate, pro peccatis, ad postulandam gratiam bene moriendi, ad tollendum schisma, contra paganos, tempore belli, pro pace, pro vitanda mortalitate, pro iter agentibus, pro infirmis.*[42]

10.—In solemn votive Masses the Orations, intonation of the *Gloria* and *Credo*, Preface, *Pater Noster*, *Ite Missa est* or *Benedicamus Domino* are sung in the *Festive Tone.*[43]

Note.—The solemn votive Mass is prescribed with regard only to its *nature*, not its application. Thus, if the Ordinary were to order a votive Mass *pro Pace* on Sunday, this Mass must be sung. If it is the parochial Mass, it must be applied *pro populo;*[44] but if it is not the parochial Mass, it can be applied for any purpose according to the intention of the celebrant or of the person who gives the stipend.[45]

[38] *White* is used—St. John, Ap. and Evang., (During the *Paschal Season* the votive Mass in honor of St. John, Ap., will be that of May 6, *ante Portam Latinam*, and the color will be *red.* Wapelhorst, Comp. S. Lit., n. 28. 2.), Conversion of St. Paul, St. Peter's *Chair*, St. Peter's *Chains.* Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. xviii, 3.

[39] The color on the feast of the Holy Innocents is *violet*, except when it falls on Sunday, when it is *red.* In votive Masses it is always *red.*

[40] Only in places in which these Masses have been granted. S.R.C., April 23, 1875, n. 3352, ad 2.

[41] *Red* in used in the Mass of the Passion *votiva per annum officio conformis.* S.R.C., Nov. 24, 1883, n. 3597, ad 2.

[42] Rub. Gen. Miss., Tit. xviii. For the color on the anniversary of the election or consecration of a Bishop and the Mass *pro sponso et sponsa* see *Privileged Votive Masses.*

[43] Haberl, *Magister Choralis*, ch. 20, etc.; S.R.C., May 19, 1607, n. 235, ad 12.

[44] In this country *decet ex charitate.* S.C. de P.F., Aug. 18, 1866, ad 2.

[45] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 261.

II.—Private Votive Masses.

11.—The Rubric of the Roman Missal[46] says that private votive Masses, whether *cantatae* or *lectae*, may be celebrated "*Quocumque die Officium non est Duplex, aut Dominica pro arbitrio Sacerdotum.*" This privilege, apparently so general, must be restricted in its application, for the rubric subjoins "*Id vero passim non fiat, nisi rationabili de causa et quoad fieri potest, Missa cum Officio conveniat.*"

A reasonable cause would be the petition of a person giving a stipend, or the special devotion of the celebrant towards a mystery or a saint.[47]

12.—Private votive Masses are permitted on all days, except

1°. On all Sundays of the year;

2°. Within the privileged octaves of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, and *Corpus Christi.*

3°. On the Vigils of Christmas, Epiphany and Pentecost.

4°. On Ash-Wednesday and during Holy Week.

5°. On Feasts of a double rite.[48]

6°. All Souls' Day, November 2d.[49]

7°. On the Rogation Days, if the procession takes place, in parish churches in which only *one* Mass is celebrated.[50]

13.—A votive Mass of a saint or a mystery cannot be celebrated on the day on which the office of such saint or mystery is recited, *e. g.*, on October 10th the Mass in honor of St. Francis Borgia must be celebrated *more festivo*, not *more votivo.*

14.—When the rite of the feast prohibits the celebration of a votive Mass, it is not allowed to add to the Mass the commemoration of the saint, or of the mystery, in whose honor a votive Mass is requested, except it is a day on which the third oration of the Mass is *ad libitum.*[51]

15.—In private votive Masses the following must be observed: The *Gloria in excelsis* is not said except

[46] Tit. iv, n. 3.

[47] St. Lig. *Theol. Moralis*, lib. vi, n. 419.

[48] S.R.C., *Decretum Generale*, June 30, 1896, n. 3922, iii.

[49] Schober, App. iii, c. 2, n. 1.

[50] Appeltern, p. 161.

[51] S.R.C., Sept. 7, 1850, n. 2981, ad 3.

(*a*) In Masses in honor of the B. Virgin Mary celebrated on *Saturday*.

(*b*) In Masses in honor of the Angels, taken singly or collectively.[52]

(*c*) In Masses of Saints, which are celebrated on the day of their death or festival day, whose office is not recited on that day, but of whom only a commemoration is made, *e.g.*, September 23d in a votive Mass celebrated in honor of St. Thecla.

(*d*) In Masses of a saint or a mystery which are celebrated during the octave of the feast; *e.g.*, December 11th is the feast of St. Damasus, *semiduplex*. On that day in a votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception the *Gloria* will be recited.

16.—*Orations.*—Private votive Masses are of a *simple rite*. Hence at least *three* orations must be recited, but more can be said, *i. e.*, *five* or *seven*, for the number must be uneven.[53]

Note 1.—The number of orations must be uneven only when they are strictly votive or *ad libitum sacerdotis*. If the rubrics prescribe *four* or *six* orations they will suffice; *e.g.*, if a votive Mass were celebrated in honor of St. Augustine on December 11th, the orations would be (1) St. Augustine, (2) St. Damasus, (3) Octave of the Immaculate Conception, (4) Ferial of Advent. These would suffice. The celebrant can add another, but he could not add *two* more, for that would make *six;* consequently he would be obliged to add *three* more to make it *seven*. In like manner if the *orationes late dictae votivae* (*Most Blessed Sacrament* during time of exposition, the *Oratio imperata*) must be added, it is not necessary that the number be *uneven*. They are simply added to the orations prescribed by the rubrics. Consequently if the rubrics prescribe *four* orations during the exposition the oration *de SS. Sacramento* is added, and if there be an *imperata* that is subjoined and the number of orations would be *six*.[54]

Note 2.—If the *orationes communes* prescribed by the rubrics (*A cunctis, de Spiritu S.*, etc.) are dropped because special com-

[52] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. viii, n. 4.

[53] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. ix, 12; Van der Stappen, Quaest. 243; De Herdt, vol. i, n. 77.

[54] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 247.

memorations take their place, it is not necessary that they should be resumed if the celebrant wishes to increase the number to *five* or *seven* orations, but any commemoration, allowed in any manner by the rubrics, may be recited.[55]

17 —*The order of the orations is as follows:—A.* 1°. Of the votive Mass; 2°. of the Mass corresponding to the office of the day; 3°. either (*a*) the special commemoration which ought to have been made in the second place of the Mass of the day, if any was to be made, or (*b*) the *commemoratio communis* proper of the season or Mass. Thus (*a*) in a votive Mass in honor of St. Aloysius on September 23d: (1) St. Aloysius, (2) St. Louis, (3) St. Thecla. (*b*) In a votive Mass in honor of St. Aloysius, on July 15th: (1) St. Aloysius, (2) St. Henry, (3) *A cunctis.*

B. If a votive Mass is celebrated in honor of a *simple* feast, which is commemorated in the Mass of the feast of the day, the oration of the simple feast cannot be repeated. Thus on September 23d in the votive Mass of St. Thecla the orations will be (1) St. Thecla, (2) St. Linus, (3) *A cunctis* (not St. Thecla again).

C. For the same reason if in a votive Mass of the B. Virgin Mary the *third* oration would, according to the *Ordo*, be *A cunctis*, this oration is changed into *de Spiritu Sancto*, because in the *A cunctis* the commemoration of the B. V. Mary would be repeated.[56] Thus if a votive Mass of the B. V. Mary were celebrated July 15th, the orations would be (1) B. V. Mary; (2) St. Henry; (3) *de Spiritu Sancto.* If the votive Mass is in honor of SS. Peter and Paul, instead of *A cunctis*, the oration *Concede nos famulos* in honor of the B. V. Mary is recited.[57]

In the votive Masses in honor of St. Joseph, the *A cunctis*, when prescribed, is recited, but the name of St. Joseph is omitted in it.[58] In the votive Mass of the Titular of the Church, either the name of the titular saint may be omitted in the *A cunctis*, or instead of the *A cunctis* the oration *Concede quaesumus*, the first among the *Orationes diversae* may be recited.[59]

[55] De Herdt, vol. i, n. 80.
[56] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. ix, n. 15.
[57] *Ibidem.*
[58] Rubr. partic. in Missa de S. Joseph inter *Missas Vto. per annum pro Feria IV.*
[59] S.R.C., May 15, 1819, n. 2597, ad iii.

D. In a votive Mass in *honorem Omnium Sanctorum* the third oration will be *de Spiritu Sancto.*[60]

E. In a votive Mass in honor of St. Peter the second oration will be of St. Paul, and in a votive Mass in honor of St. Paul the second oration will be of St. Peter.[61]

F. The order to be observed in the *orationes votivae stricte dictae* is the *ordo dignitatis;* and in regard to the *Orationes diversae* found in the Missal, the order given there is to be observed.[62]

18.—*Sequences* proper of the festive Mass are never recited in *votive* Masses.[63] *Credo* is never recited in private votive Masses; this is even the case if a votive Mass of a saint or mystery is celebrated during the octave of such a saint or mystery, although *ratione octavae* it would be recited in Mass were it *conformis officio diei;*[64] *e g.*, if on December 11th, the feast of St. Damasus, the votive Mass of the Immaculate Conception is celebrated, the *Credo* is not recited.

19.—For the Preface, special *Communicantes*, *Ite Missa est* and *Benedicamus Domino*, Gospel at end of Mass and special rubrics of Passiontide, vid. **7.** 5°, 6°, 7°, 8°, and **8** above.

20.—If a private votive Mass is celebrated solemnly or in chant, the orations are sung in the *tonus simplex ferialis;* the Preface and *Pater Noster* in the *tonus ferialis;* the *Ite Missa est* or *Benedicamus Domino* in the *tonus simplex;* except the *Ite Missa est* in votive Masses of the Blessed Virgin, which is sung as in all other Masses celebrated in her honor.

S. L. T.

A PLEA FOR CATHOLIC AGNOSTICISM.

A FEW weeks ago I turned up the letters of a dear friend and fellow student some years younger than myself when we were together, and now, alas, some years dead. At the lower end of the bundle is a little sheaf of papers tied together with green

[60] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 246, 4°.

[61] *Ibidem* 2°; Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. vii, n. 5.

[62] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 248.

[63] S.R.C., Sept. 16, 1673, n. 1490, ad 2 March 21, 1795, n. 2550, ad 2.

[64] S.R.C., *Decretum Gen. de Missis Votivis*, June 30, 1896, n. 3922, iii, 3.

tape separate from the rest. It is labelled "Catholic Agnosticism," and is a series of letters, the last he ever wrote me, in which he sketches with a purposely light but, as I think, suggestive touch, some of the difficulties of an ecclesiastical student as they appeared to him. I have re-read these letters of late with more interest than I gave to them some years ago. And it has occurred to me that they might have interest for a wider circle of readers. The points made have been seconded by my own after-experience and by a great deal that I have at various times since heard urged by men neither incompetent nor reckless anent ecclesiastical studies. For myself I should never be at pains to work up an indictment against an existing system. That is a wearisome business at best, and it is none of mine. Perhaps, too, an unsuccessful student is not the best critic of educational methods. I do not think he need be the worst; but let that pass. I have the pleasantest recollections of my student days, yet they are purely personal of the men I met and lived with. It was no great grief, and, as I think, no great intellectual loss to me when I heard my last lecture. Perhaps I was not altogether fortunate in my experience. I think I may have picked up a little knowledge since, from men and books both, but chiefly the former. I do not easily harbor resentment and do not feel disposed to enter the lists against any eager defender of the system under which it is ordained for wise reasons that we should suffer discomfort for a time. If I have views, I am by no means prepared to burn for them. I have the saving good sense to see that after all it may be the subject, not the system, that is at fault.

There are a few questions, however, that often come to my mind. Are the men for the system, or should the system be for the men? Should it be suited to the many or the few? And is it not the fact that among Anglo-Saxons at least the type of mind best suited to the present methods is not too commonly found? Can that presentment of doctrine which so minimizes the real difficulties—confuses them with "objections"—be the one best calculated to fit us to solve those difficulties for others when they are offered to us for solution? Or can a body of apologetic constructed mainly to appeal to those within be the best for those who, like ourselves, have so largely to work upon those without?

I have often heard this said:—"It is sheer want of logic which keeps men out of the Church." It is an amazing dictum, and itself an indirect indictment of the system. But grant it true; we cannot teach men dialectics. If they, foolish no doubt, will have none of our method, might it not be possible to go to work another way?—as a certain Paul would have done—to say nothing of his Master. Are the needs, the environment of the Church, the same in America as in Italy, in England, and in Austria?

Would there be as much waste of time as one has in fact observed at college,—such, I have heard say, as could not be afforded and would not be tolerated in any profession besides our own,—if there were more reality about the presentment of the matter? Can anyone who has seen the bulk of any class at examination time "get up" its theses as a schoolboy gets up his Euclid, and with no more vital interest, be called perverse, if he fail to be impressed? How many missioners has one met who have shut up that chapter of their lives with a snap and a "No-more-Euclid-for-me?" And who shall blame them? These questions are, of course, purely rhetorical.

With regard to my friend's position. It sufficiently explains itself and needs no apology of mine. It was his habit commonly to say both more and less than he meant, to touch most lightly what he often felt most keenly. It seems to me that he often hit nearer the mark than he guessed.

I have freely edited his manuscript; for brevity's sake cutting out all personal references, all repetitions, and, as far as might be, making a consecutive whole of the scattered and discursive parts. The result is given for what it is worth as the thoughtful register of an experience.

Carissime,

You want to know what I have been doing. Well, the doctor condemned me to a rest—a most acceptable condemnation—but I had to do something, and I've done it. I've founded a new school, a school of philosophy, you know. The thing had long been on as much of my mind as I've got left after these terrible years of study. Now at last the great idea has come to birth

—and I am doing well, thank you, considering. I am now a Catholic Agnostic, the first, as I proudly believe. For the present my intention holds to limit the number of members to one, as this ensures a certain desirable unity and uniformity. There is to be no proselytizing. We acknowledge regretfully that Catholic Agnosticism is not the philosophy of the present and cannot obtain till the mists of cocksureness have lifted. But the future —who can tell what the future may bring? On the strength of the obvious answer to this question I am as free to prophesy as any other. CATHOLIC AGNOSTICISM, the child itself, even if repudiated, of the philosophy of the past is to be the mother of the philosophy of the future—when she is old enough, which is scarcely yet.

And now I am going to lay bare my soul to you—to you who have sat on the same hard benches in the schools with me, have battered the same relentless desks with your *Summa Theologica* in noisy (and perhaps sometimes ironical) approval of all that came from the rostrum. I must call up pathetic memories! You remember how . . . heartfully and artlessly we set to work in that first year with a fresh headlong enthusiasm, exulting that at last it had something worthy to put its hand to. How we threaded the mazes of formal logic; how we learned to quote the mediæval poets—"Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferioque prioris," and other tender lines; how we established several kinds of certitude, tackled and vanquished the "ens ut sic;" how we did many other things which I've forgotten, pleased on the one hand with the pace and the ease with which we had demolished adversaries the most formidable, and on the other, if anywhere the ways were dark and heavy, promising ourselves light and rest in no long time: for did we not follow a worthy mistress, Divine Philosophy? —and would she not provide?

Well, then there came a check. I had been having conversation with our professor and had, I suppose, been hurling irresponsibly at him my poor maimed syllogisms; and at the close of our conference he had delivered himself of the conviction that of the many who studied our philosophy a very meagre remnant attained to anything more than a certain skill in juggling with the terms. They *never* got, he said, at the heart of the matter. Of course I

was very sorry for them, for I could not suppose him to be referring to me. Indeed, perhaps, he was not, for I then had not reached the stage of proficient juggling. But I have since learned to understand and apply his fruitful words. If I have also applied them largely to others, that, after all, is but human.

This, then, was check number one. Then, you'll remember, later the air became thick with the hurtling distinctions and subdistinctions of the realists and virtualists, and again I forget what you did, but I attached myself as a noisy adherent to the realist camp. Of course, as I now see, from purely personal motives, but as I then thought because of the obvious justice of the cause. Thereby came the second check. It was another professor—the professor, look you, whose cause I had so ably championed—who said to me one day (I had probably been torturing his nerves with my discordant battle-cries and the noisy rattle of my ineffectual harness), "You're very much too young to have an opinion worth one button on this subject. A conclusion can't be arrived at without years of consecutive thought"—and more to the same agreeable and unmistakable effect.

Of course I was badly hit, and cultivated, so to speak, the arts of peace; which, being interpreted, might mean did a little judicious idling. And though I have ventured out on a few occasions later and sawn the air awhile, yet never with the same confident battle-joy in my heart. And now I have permanently hung my armor on a willow tree, together with my harp and some other things belonging to that period.

But those words were a fruitful seed; they have blossomed into the thorn of Catholic Agnosticism. But pardon: I am anticipating.

We next broke ground in Cosmology—*continuums* and *actio in distans* and bilocation. And at this point we airily proved (did we not?) that it was not a little bit repugnant to reason that a body should exist in two, or, for the matter of that, half a dozen places at once. Well, if the saints have in fact been in two places at once and not rather some subjective phantasm, if you will, miraculous, in the second alleged place—but grant the fact that they have been; then let us believe it with an honest admission that we do not understand the business. For what other conclusion can a plain man draw from our attempt to "prove" points like these

than that we are guilty of a reckless and unpardonable trifling, of, if I may so say, a dishonest cooking of the accounts of reasoning to meet certain emergencies? May we not leave these things in the realm of mystery, where surely they were meant to remain? This was my thought then and still is more emphatically. I could see my professor believed far otherwise. But I never recovered from the shock I got in this affair. And this effect was heightened by the consideration of the obvious external aspects of a controversy already alluded to—the real distinction between Essence and Existence. Here were Realists and Virtualists, at the head of either party a man of conspicuous metaphysical keenness, coming from the same fundamental premises, with the same education, and in the same Church and schools, to irreconcilable conclusions on a question which one side at least claimed to be of first importance. The point which struck me was not so much that one side was right and the other wrong, while there was no means of deciding which: for it is just conceivable that neither may have been right; but this, that if minds which took to metaphysics as duck to duck-pond were in these straits, what were the chances of minds with such a hopeless inclination to the concrete as my own?—as many another besides my own? Of course I do not fail to see that this difficulty could be pushed to awkward extremes, but I am not attempting a coherent apologetic; I am only registering my impressions for you. After all, it would be inconsistent with our position to answer any difficulties; so let me go on.

It seemed idle to advance in the above connection that these differences of opinion were not on points essential to the faith. Of course not, or there would have been bonfires—of *books* merely, I suppose, in these mild days. But I was tempted to state the matter in my own way, as thus. These thinkers agree in so far as authority compels them. At the point of freedom the ways part. From which this inference is at least *possible*, that the agreement is the result not of the reasoning, but of the authority; while the reasoning is merely an elaborate and convenient artifice accommodated to a body of doctrine already established on a separate ground. I don't say I was fool enough to make this bold, bald reference; but I do say that under its crude exaggeration it hides a truth; it indicates the danger in a philosophy

which is handmaiden to a doctrinal system (of course in no way opposed to syllogism but largely independent of it)—the danger, namely, which is incident to the concluding of foregone conclusions.

The notorious bilocation theorem is but one notable example of this tendency realized. I remember too a theologian of repute telling me that it was always a point of amused interest to him to see the new machinery of defence which had to be manufactured when any new decree or research-results appeared. Now to me this casual adjustment of apologetic means logically something very like a confession of Agnosticism, in my applied sense of the term. For it seems to me to suggest not merely that a makeshift proof can be made to order to meet any difficulty, but also that some at least of the present defences are of the same equivocal character. And if some, which? The philosophical doctrines of substance, for instance, or of matter and form? Let us both say a fervent *Absit.*

And there was one other point connected with this real distinction controversy which contributed to my mental discomfort.

Prior to Leo XIII's Letter on the following of Saint Thomas, the Virtualists had been frankly Suaresian. After it, they discovered that the Angelic Doctor was, after all, himself a Virtualist, and that only the happy accident of the Holy Father's Letter had disclosed the pregnant fact. The explaining away of all those passages which had hitherto been the accredited authoritative support of the Realists was a very creditable exhibition of slight-of-mind, and the fact that our worthy Professor could accomplish it with such complete and serene satisfaction is just a proof of how fearfully and wonderfully we are made. Don't you think this is at least a fair inference and a tolerable ground for Agnosticism?

Observe the seeds had been fairly sown, and, if the trope be not offensive, there was plenty of manure. I have spoken of cocksureness and hinted not obscurely that it does not comfort me. Now if difficulties had been admitted; if there had been any patient recognition of the aggressive, manifold perplexities which beset any attempt to consistently explain the larger riddles; if opponents had been left so much as a poor leg of wood to stand

on; if the successive stories of our imposing edifice had been added with less ease and inevitabe swiftness; if these things and some others had not been, there had never perhaps been a school of Catholic Agnosticism and my occupation had been wanting.

Well, to continue. Perhaps you can't expect a text-book to be other than infallibly cocksure, because space is an object, and to be fair is doubtless a long matter. But mightn't a Professor, without loss of caste, admit there were more things in heaven and earth than could with decency be packed into the bowels of a syllogism, that there have been heterodox thinkers and theses since the flood proof against more than a couple of subdistinctions?

You remember our professor of physics, keen, alert, Germanly thorough, and loyal to the finger tips; who dreamed dreams amid his test tubes, his bunsens, and his batteries, who spoke of readjustments; who would indicate, not in lecture time indeed (for this was no philosophy for the housetops), that these same tubes and batteries gave, as far as he could see, disproof of certain cosmological theses which not twelve yards away his Italian colleague expounded from the rostrum infallibly. The experiment stood against the syllogism, and who were you and I that we should presume to decide between them? In particular, do you remember his one day saying that as in no case could you touch the mystery of the Eucharist, for the rest Dynamism was as adequate a partial basis of explanation as Hylomorphism, besides having the advantage of being true?

And when I analyzed this subject of the differences, I came to what I suppose cannot be an original conclusion. It was obvious that in Euclid, for instance, or Algebra, there was no scope for doctors to arrive at adverse conclusions, nor for disciples to be bluffed or misled. The terms are clear-cut and definite, the conclusions absolute and irresistible. And it occurred to me that the philosophers were practically assuming Euclidian methods and exactness in a matter that did not admit of such exactness; obviously did not, from the bare fact of the differences which existed. To be able to prove anything and everything meant to be able to prove too much. And this meant —— I got me a petard out of the scholastic magazine and said (to myself, of

course), "Qui nimium probat nihil probat;" and here was the rankest scepticism. But—and this is my true point—being a Catholic and following a guide that cannot fail, I know all I need to know. It is merely beyond this that I am an agnostic—a Catholic Agnostic.

Don't ask me yet to explain how I'd get as far as the Church without a syllogism or two. Well I shouldn't. But I'd get there not on syllogisms alone. Later, when I have worked it out, you shall have it—it will need a good deal of working out—and at present I am tired. After all, one does not found a school every day, and I deserve a rest.

I feel tempted to say something about our fellow-students; no, nothing unkind. But you'll remember certain of them, worthy folk indeed, but scarce illuminative in ordinary relations of life, who with a text-book in their hands recklessly sallied forth like giants to run their course—preferably the long course, you know; glibly proved the immortality of the soul in a couple of syllogisms, answered all difficulties (you will understand me to mean all in the text-book), riddled and ridiculed Kant and Spinoza and Fichte and Schelling and Berkeley and Locke and Leibnitz and Descartes and Rosmini, slew their thousands (I am tempted to borrow an old witticism) "like Sampson and with the same weapon," and finally, being men of unimpaired digestion, achieved triumph in their examinations and set to work cheerfully and snugly on another text-book for another year. This is unkind, after all, but I can't help it. They've worried me, at times, and then I haven't got the digestion.

I think I have met some older men who must have done these things in their day, the didactic, controversial, unapproachables who can so readily prove their thesis in detail that they are incapable of revising it to fit in with another's. Men from whom the seekers from without (and from within, too, for that matter) must turn with tears in their eyes or shrugged shoulders, according to temperament; men who give stones for bread, and for fish mere snakes. You have met them, *Carissime*, yourself, I am sure, and have dropped the stones sadly. Yet men withal—and what a riddle it is!—whose shoes we often be not worthy to tie.

And I could not help thinking that when someone with large

desires and wide heart arises to do something to free himself or others from the bonds of formalism in any one direction, strenuous in protest against conventions that are outworn, eager to make the dry bones live, to speak to the hearts of this people, it is these men who own the fingers that will point suspiciously at him and the thumbs which, if he chance to take a wound in the arena, will point relentlessly downwards. Well, that's somewhat bitter, and rather represents a mood I had than have. For now I see that such things are inevitable and therefore largely excusable and, in time, altogether forgivable.

Still, these and the like considerations were a substantial factor in the making of my Agnosticism and must find a place here. I so dreaded becoming one of the impossibles, a formalist, a Catholic positivist, shall we say?

Every wheatfield has its complement of tares, whether the enemy be of the good man's household or not; every system has its peculiar difficulty and danger; and I do not think any reflective man would deny that our own training tends to foster formalism and unreality. For in our years of pupilage we stand apart —for good and wise reasons, I know—yet untouched and unpolished by the friction of criticism, and therefore are we peculiarly liable to the blight of provincialism. We speak and are spoken to in an idiom not understanded of the people to whom we in turn are destined to speak; we minimize the intellectual difficulties of our position, we magnify its intellectual justifications. It may be said that the shell of such conventions will fall away from us at the right time and leave us free as the eagle to use our pinions. But it may be readily observed in fact that such shells often rather tend to solidify by fresh accretions, like that of a much less progressive creature—the oyster, to wit. I hope my natural history is sound, seeing that the comparison is not inapt.

Few perhaps of those who even see the necessity of translating their formal and, as it were, dead knowledge into living, current thought and language, have the time or the energy or the acquired habit necessary to do so. Their habit is, *ex hypothesi*, in the other direction. As the tree falls at the end of a student's course, so, very broadly speaking, shall it lie. Or if that seem too wooden an example, here is a parable at hand. A doctor

friend of mine whose work lies much among the poor, was called for suddenly the other day to a two-year-old baby in an alarming fit. It transpired that it had breakfasted exclusively on tinned salmon. I have a notion that there is much tinned salmon served up in schools, and that mental constitutions are sometimes warped by it. And tinned salmon, you'll observe, is an unseasonable variant on the two legitimate foods—milk for babies and meat for men. Oh! but this is an excellent parable truly!

Again, the very stability and definiteness of our faith, unparalleled blessing as it is, yet brings with it just this danger of our not being readily able to enter sympathetically into positions outside our own. This is pity enough; but when we add to it the exasperating cocksureness of a philosophy which must at best be only a partial solution of the great enigmas, surely we greatly intensify the danger! Theoretically, an explicit effort should be made to modify this tendency; actually, the tendency is directly fostered.

And I would venture to say, too, that there are some who, like myself, sit fruitlessly and listlessly upon our benches under a teaching which is cast in a mould unsuited to their minds, who could give their time and their enthusiasm with profit to a more concrete and tangible apologetic. Do you think, I may ask in parenthesis, that among so many men of such good will who have generously given their all—though it be but nets—to the service of God in our not too easy or naturally attractive life—do you think that there would be found such waste of time and opportunity, such lack of desire for the bread of knowledge, if it were, shall we say, better baked? There are older and saner heads than mine that think these thoughts, for more convincing reasons doubtless than I have here suggested.

Now, what frankly does all this amount to? That I am discouraged and bewildered. "Temporary Bewilderment" would indeed more aptly express my state of mind than Catholic Agnosticism. But I should hardly care to pose as the founder of a school of Temporary Bewilderment (there are plenty already anyway), and the more dignified style is no whit more expensive.

I would further hazard the guess from my own brief and narrow experience, that more of us suffer from a like discourage-

ment than care to proclaim the fact in the public ways. But this is as it may be.

Anyway I live in hope, and the grounds of my hope are—well, as vague perhaps as some of the sources of my despair. But here are two of the more tangible items. The keenest and subtlest scholastic I know is also modern and human to the finger-tips; his dream, as I read it, is the translation of the idiom of scholasticism into that of to-day. He is a standing proof that a scholastic need not be a mediævalist, as the taunt is phrased. Here then I say to my disillusioned self, for whom I am so sorry, here is promise of reconciliation. And for my second point, another enthusiastic Thomist confessed to me the need of such a reconciliation in no measured terms, admitting that Neo-scholasticism in the exuberance of its renewed youth had sadly overshot the mark, and that a phase of reaction was inevitable. May I be there to see! and if it be satisfactory, I engage to burn my brief for Catholic Agnosticism.

Now, I have been fairly serious in these last paragraphs, haven't I, *caro mio?* Suppose I make a supreme effort and say something quite earnest; something quite obvious, indeed, but none the less true for that.

Taking a general survey of the men we have seen about us and above us we can recognize two main classes, quite distinct in aim and ideal. Broadly, they represent two principles as inevitable in religion as in politics,—I mean, of course, conservatism and progressivism: inevitable and useful, not, of course, that party spirit and party methods are of themselves desirable in any sphere, least of all in religion, but because "storm and stress" is the vital principle of progress. Now in each camp there are those—the noisiest, who do much to discredit the cause of the wise and holy men who are to be found above them. On the one hand there are the restless and self-confident, prematurely conscious of a mission to set right the universal Church, who will without quarter condemn systems and persons they have not the experience or capacity to fairly estimate, who have no use for reticence, who have not learned to wait. At the other extreme are narrow, illiberal men who distrust and condemn all that they may not have heard before, who do not seem to understand the possi-

bility of a faith which is sturdy enough to face the difficulties of fact and of theory that are plain to any but veiled eyes, who are ready to impute disloyalty, and who conceive that anyone who is willing, say, to surrender a cherished legend as resting on insufficient evidence, is thereby trying to undermine the pillar and ground of truth.:

Enough hard things have been said of the former. Here are words that struck me as having, *mutatis mutandis*, a certain application to the latter:

"Let who will sweat and agonize for the sake of a new truth or a purer form of an old one. There are those who will stand aside and coldly regard, if they cannot crush the struggle and the heartbreak of the pioneers, and then will enter into the fruit of their labors, and complacently point in later years to the advance of thought in their time which they have done nothing to advance, but to which when sanctioned by time and custom they will adhere."

But both these classes are extremists, and thoughtless and convention-loving extremists at that. Our concern is with the sober representative men on either side, each working for the cause of God and of the Church in the measure of light and grace accorded to him. Now a man who thinks and feels must sooner or later, better perhaps later, take his stand in one camp or the other; but it should be without bitterness, with all respect and tolerance for the cause he does not see his way to embrace, content to acknowledge that both views are but partial and complementary aspects of a greater whole whose complexity puts it beyond the adequate grasp of our feeble minds. There is room for both and work for both, enough and to spare.

Now, whatever it be, temperament, sentiment, affection, bias, call it what you will, that points to each one his banner, I can see where mine flies when the time comes to stand by it; and if occasion call, I am not ashamed of it even now. Thereby I earn from inconsiderate ancients of the conservative bias the easy style and title of a young fool. Well, if it were any use (which it isn't), I should tell these worthy folk that the young fools of to-day are the wise men of to-morrow—which is an aphorism I made all by myself. Do you know I have always counted it gain to be a

young fool in this explicit sense. I do not ignore the maladies incident to the early unpleasant stages, but they pass, and, after all, it is better to have had certain complaints. And I have never been altogether impressed by the argument of years as adduced by some venerable counsellor, just because I could always point to men as old, not to say as wise, from whom I had myself learned my creeds. And in general it might be said that the world is not pushed round by men above the age of three score years and ten. Well, I've lapsed from the serious again, I'm afraid. Pardon . . .

Some weeks after this I received what was no more than a postscript to what had gone before, beginning and ending with a few words of common friendliness—the last I ever had from him.

I must send you a postscript, I have something to tell you. Dr. M—— put in my hands the other day, after one of my rebellious outbreaks, *The Grammar of Assent*, telling me to read the last supreme chapter. To think that no one of my old professors should have helped me to it before! It was a conspiracy surely! It had been no more than an unattractive title to me. There was no one to put me in the pool which would have eased my malady at a touch. Here is that constructive element which Catholic Agnosticism could not give. And its message—"Non in dialecticâ placuit Deo salvum facere populum suum"—how good! It is what I have fumbled for in the dark these four years. And now I too am dreaming dreams. . . . The doctor will not let me do overmuch reading at present. But when the spring comes and the larch buds and the good sun, then you shall see what you shall see. . . . Good-bye. Say a prayer for me sometimes.

He did not see the spring, and the "good sun" throws the shadows of his beloved larches across his quiet grave. *R. I. P.*

My task is here at an end. There are some human enough to know that experience is not merely nor even mainly a matter of years, and that much wisdom may often be read between the lines of a jest. It is to them that the above papers are offered.

A Mission Priest.

THE UNION OF THE EARLY IRISH CHURCH WITH THE HOLY ROMAN SEE.[1]

(Conclusion.)

PROTESTANT writers triumphantly appeal to the attitude of St. Columbanus towards the Holy See, and to the action of Ireland in the well-known controversy regarding the exact time at which the Easter festival was to be celebrated, as unanswerable proofs of Ireland's rejection of Papal supremacy, at the beginning of the seventh century. Let me show that both questions, far from affording any real argument to our opponents, supply us with strong testimony to the contrary.

There are some well-known letters written by St. Columbanus to two Popes of his time. The occasion which called for this correspondence was as follows: From the time the Saint left Ireland, in 580, till his death in 615, he was engaged in preaching the Gospel, and founding monasteries in different parts of France, Switzerland, and Italy. During his stay in France, he and his disciples adhered tenaciously to the traditional Irish method of computing the day for the celebration of Easter which, as a movable feast, depended on certain astronomical calculations. The French Bishops took umbrage at this, and called upon the Saint to conform to the Continental custom. Columbanus declined, and appealed to Pope Gregory the Great in a letter which has been preserved to us, although there is no record of any reply, whence it has been surmised that it never reached its actual destination. From the very fact of this appeal, even if for the moment we abstract entirely from its contents, it is plain that both Columbanus and the Gaulish Bishops recognized the authority of the Roman See to act as arbiter in such a controversy.

There exists a second letter, on the same subject, which the Saint addressed subsequently to Pope Boniface IV. No Irish Bishop of to-day could word an appeal expressing in more forcible language a subject's loyal attachment to and affection for the Supreme Father of Christendom, than does this letter of St. Columbanus. Beginning with a salutation which breathes profound respect for the Pope, he declares his regret that circum-

[1] See March issue, page 302.

stances have prevented his approaching in person the throne of those elect Pontiffs who occupy "the Apostolic Chair, most dear to all the faithful, and most revered because of their Apostolic dignity." He thus humbly petitions the Holy Father to confirm the Irish Paschal custom, but only if it be not opposed to Catholic doctrine. "As in duty bound, to you alone we present our petition, that . . . you might confirm the tradition of our fathers, *if it be not against the faith*, and so by your decree enable us to observe the Paschal rite as we have inherited it from our fathers." These words are significant. The Saint presents his petition to the Pope, implying that in this matter the Holy See had sovereign authority. He humbly asks to be enabled to retain the customs of his ancestors, "if it be not against the faith," which words indicate first that Columbanus recognized the Pope's right to decide whether or not the aforesaid custom was against the faith; and secondly that, if it were declared against the faith, the Saint was ready to bow to the adverse decision. Plainly, our opponents cannot get much comfort from either of these letters.

The last letter which we have from St. Columbanus to the Pope was written in 613, two years before his death, that is at the time when he had already founded the famous monastery at Bobbio, in North Italy. The Saint's purpose in writing to Boniface IV was to rouse the Pontiff to action against some heretics in Northern Italy who still defended the orthodoxy of the "Three Chapters."[2]

The letter furnishes our adversaries matter for two arguments. The first is drawn from the alleged tone of severity with which the Saint appears to reprove the Pope; the second from an expression which seems to indicate that Columbanus regarded the Roman Pontiff as inferior in dignity to the Bishop of Jerusalem. The first charge might be readily granted without detriment to the Pope's supremacy. We have a similar case in St. Paul's action toward St. Peter at Antioch.[3] To rebuke a Pope is not the same thing as to deny his authority. As to the second

[2] The "Three Chapters" is the name given to three propositions embodied in an edict issued by the Emperor Justinian against certain Sectaries who denied the Catholic doctrine of two natures in Christ.

[3] Galat. 2 : 11.

charge, it rests upon a misinterpretation of the words "singular prerogative," applied to the See of Jerusalem. St. Columbanus, speaking of Rome, says that it is "the head of the Churches of the world, saving the singular prerogative of the place of the Lord's Resurrection." Now it is very easy to understand by this expression what, in view of his clear language regarding the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman See, in other parts of the letter, the Saint must have meant; namely, that, although Rome was the head of all the Churches, yet in one respect the Church of Jerusalem enjoyed a preëminence, since it was the scene of our Lord's glorious Resurrection. There is no reference to ecclesiastical superiority, for we know that previous to the Council of Nice the Bishops of Jerusalem had been subject to the Metropolitan of Cesarea, and even after that date the Bishop remained for a time under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch. Indeed the letter itself leaves us in no doubt on the main point; for, after expressing in the introduction his profound respect for the "Head of all the Churches," the Saint gives the following account of the condition of the Irish Church: "We Irish are the disciples of St. Peter and St. Paul. Amongst us neither Jew, heretic, nor schismatic can be found; but the Catholic Faith, unaltered, unshaken, precisely as *we have received it from you*, who are the successor of the Apostles. For, as I have already said, we are attached to the Church of Peter, and although Rome is great and illustrious, yet with us it is great and illustrious only on account of the Apostolic Chair. Through the two Apostles of Christ, you are almost celestial, and *Rome is the Head of the Churches of the World.*" Could anything be clearer and more emphatic than this language?

"We Irish," he says, "have the Catholic Faith unaltered, precisely as we received it from you." Here, contrary to the assertion of Dr. Todd and his followers, the Saint openly declares his belief in the Roman origin of the Irish Church; in other words, he believes in the Roman Mission of St. Patrick. The words, "We are attached to the Chair of St. Peter," are no less true of our present Irish Church than of that which St. Patrick founded; but I fancy it cannot be said of the law-established institution to which Dr. Healy, Dr. Stokes, and Mr. Alden belong. The Saint

adds: "Though Rome is great and illustrious, yet with us it is great and illustrious only on account of the Apostolic Chair." The Popes had frequently found it necessary, especially in dealing with the Church of Constantinople, to make it clear that the supremacy of Rome was in no way due to the political importance of the once proud Mistress of the World. No need for such warning to the Irish Church. The children of St. Patrick, guided by his teaching and by the unerring instinct of a living faith, understood that the true reason of the greatness of the Eternal City was the fact of its being the home of the Vicar of Christ.

I have something still to say of the Paschal controversy, though I shall be very brief. As the name implies, this controversy turned about the proper time for the celebration of Easter. In the days of Pope Celestine, the cycle used in Rome for the computation of Easter was the Jewish cycle of 84 years, and this cycle St. Patrick introduced into Ireland. After the time of Celestine, the cycle was twice altered by the Roman authorities, and in 525 the Alexandrian cycle was finally adopted. These changes were not introduced immediately into the Irish and the British Church, for communication with Rome was rendered difficult owing to the occupation of England by the barbarous followers of Hengist and Horsa. At length, early in the seventh century, public attention was called to the matter, because St. Columbanus had brought over to France and persisted in maintaining the ancient custom observed in Ireland. The Irish showed themselves rather unwilling to abandon the calendar introduced by their beloved Apostle, and Protestant writers affect to see in this reluctance to conform to the Roman custom of later times an argument proving that the Irish Church did not acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. Now, in the first place, it ought to be perfectly plain that the question was purely a matter of discipline, not of doctrine.

It is a matter dependent on astronomical calculation, and the infallible Church of Rome had no hesitation in twice changing her mind on the subject. Secondly, the details of the action of the Irish Church in the matter afford convincing proof, not only that the Pope's authority was then acknowledged in Ireland, but that it had been so from the introduction of Christianity. It is well known that the Irish Bishops received their first intimation that

they differed from the practice of the Universal Church in the observance of Easter, through Lawrence, Archbishop of Canterbury. Some of them expressed their willingness to conform to the Roman and English custom, but by far the greater number was determined to stand by the ancient tradition received from St. Patrick. At length they summoned the Synod of Magh-lene, a full account of which is given us by St. Cummian, a monk of Durrow, in a letter to Segenius, Abbot of Iona. The question was warmly debated by the assembled Fathers. "St. Cummian advocated the adoption of the Roman custom, his principle being: 'whoever is joined to the Chair of St. Peter, with him shall I be.'" At length he tells us that *in accordance with an ancient canon of the Irish Church*, they determined to send to Rome "wise and humble men *as children to their mother*," to inquire about the proper method of keeping Easter. These deputies returned after three years, bringing[4] with them a letter from Pope Honorius I. This letter of the Holy Father, exhorting the Irish Bishops to conform to the Roman custom, was publicly read at the Synod of Old Leighlin, and forthwith the improved cycle was adopted throughout the greater part of Ireland. The North indeed, through attachments to St. Columba, held out for some time against the innovation; but even there the Roman custom was adopted when Thomian, Archbishop of Armagh, had a second time *referred the matter to the Holy See.*

These facts speak for themselves. The Irish Bishops and priests in the beginning of the seventh century are unable to agree amongst themselves on a point of ecclesiastical discipline. How do they act? Precisely as they would act to-day if a similar difficulty arose. They refer the matter to Rome in the spirit of filial piety, "*as children to their mother.*" They learn the decision of the Vicar of Christ, and they obey without demur. Thus the Fathers assembled at Old Leighlin in practice adopted the faith of the great Bishop of Hippo: "Roma locuta est: causa finita est."

The Paschal controversy proves beyond all doubt that the Irish Church of the seventh century recognized Papal supremacy.

[4] Some writers state that this letter was sent before the Council had been summoned.

But it does more. It gives us to understand that that doctrine was believed in Ireland from the introduction of Christianity. The Fathers of Magh-lene, by appealing to Rome, did not introduce a new custom; we are expressly told by Cummian that they merely acted in accordance with an ancient synodal decree. This decree is embodied in an ancient canon of the year 457, *and its author is St. Patrick.* It is found in full in that venerable MS. to which I have so often referred, the Book of Armagh. The learned O'Curry, commenting on this ancient canon, speaks of it as "of special interest, since it preserves to us the most perfect evidence of the connection of the Catholic Church of Erinn with the See of Rome, from the very first introduction of Christianity." Let me quote this decree in full: "Moreover, if any case of extreme difficulty shall arise, and one which the various judges of the Irish nation cannot decide, let it be referred to the See of the chief Bishop of the Irish (that is, of St. Patrick). But if such a case of the aforesaid importance cannot easily be decided in that See, we have decreed that it be sent to the Apostolic See, that is to say, to the Chair of the Apostle Peter, which holds the authority of the See of Rome. These are the persons who decreed as above, viz., Auxilius, *Patrick*, Secundinus, and Benignus." No one questions the genuineness of this canon. O'Curry points out, moreover, that this canon is found in that part of the old MS. which was copied from the book *written by St. Patrick's own hand.* The authenticity of the decree was admitted by Ussher, who thence concludes that "it is most likely that St. Patrick had a special regard for the Church of Rome." It was acted upon, as we have seen, at the Synod of Magh-lene, 200 years after St. Patrick, and in a collection of canons, the *Hibernensis*, compiled for the Irish Church about the year 700 (a century before the Book of Armagh was written), we find a decree of similar import, explicitly ascribed to St. Patrick. St. Patrick defines as follows: "Should any grave controversies arise in this island, they should be referred to the Apostolic See." What conclusion are we to draw from all this? Simply that which common sense forces upon us, even if we had not the unimpeachable evidence of these ancient decrees. From his youth St. Patrick was trained up to believe in Papal supremacy. That doctrine was

believed in by St. Martin and St. Honoratus, and was taught in their respective schools of Tours and Lerins in which our Saint prepared himself for his missionary career. His last preceptor, St. Germanus, was actually Papal Legate. Before setting out for Ireland, St. Patrick sets out for Rome, to obtain for his enterprise the blessing and approval of the Sovereign Pontiff. Surely, all this would lead us naturally to the assumption *a priori* that belief in Papal supremacy formed part of the religious system established by him in Ireland. And here it is amusing to note how careful both Dr. Todd and Dr. Stokes of Trinity, while doing their utmost to disprove St. Patrick's Roman mission, are to add, that such a commission would not, by any means, show the dependence of the early Irish Church on the See of Rome. As an illustration, Dr. Todd gives the case of a bishop being sent into the interior of Africa with the sanction of Canterbury, which, says he, would not prove the supremacy of the Primate of England; and Dr. Stokes, borrowing the idea, asks whether the fact of the first bishop in the United States having derived his orders from the Church of Scotland, proves the supremacy of the Scotch Bishops over the American Church. The reply is simple. We deny the parity till Dr. Todd can tell us of an Archbishop of Canterbury claiming and exercising universal jurisdiction, and having that claim recognized by the Universal Church, or in fact until Dr. Todd can find a Protestant Pope enjoying similar privileges.

I have thus far shown that the primacy and supremacy of the Holy See formed a portion of the ecclesiastical system established in Ireland by St. Patrick. It follows as a corollary that the primitive Irish Church was in union with the Church of Rome in all matters of doctrine, and in all essentials of discipline. Let us take a glance, however, at the evidence afforded by the written memorials of the ancient Irish Church regarding the faith of our fathers.

We begin with the Blessed Eucharist. *The Leabhar Breac*, described by the great scholar Petrie as "the oldest and best MS. relating to church history now preserved or which the Irish ever had," thus explains the nature of this august Sacrament: "Another division of that pledge, which has been left with the Church to

comfort her, is the Body of Christ and His Blood, *which are offered* on the altars of Christians: the Body even which was born of Mary the Immaculate Virgin, . . . which was crucified by the unbelieving Jews, . . . and which sits upon the right hand of God the Father in heaven. . . . It is that Body, the same as it is in this great glory, which the righteous consume off God's Holy Table, *i. e.*, the Holy Altar." In another place the same old MS. says, "It is not the priest *who offers up the sacrifice* at all, but Jesus Christ Himself who blesses and converts the loaves and wine into the real nature of His Body and His own Blood." No Catholic theologian of the present day, no preacher, no ascetic writer, could possibly express more forcibly the doctrine of the Real Presence, and of the Sacrifice of the Mass. With such perspicuous language the idea of quibbling, evasion, and distortion of meaning is absolutely incompatible. As well dispute the belief of the author of the "Imitation of Christ" in the Real Presence, as call into question the faith of the author of the *Leabhar Breac*, in the same venerable mystery.

I referred to the writings of St. Columbanus, to show the belief of our fathers in Papal supremacy. Let me now appeal to the same great light of our infant Irish Church for testimony to her reception of the distinctly Catholic doctrines of Confession of sins, and the Real Presence. The following is from his Poenitential. "It is ordered, moreover, that confessions be given with all diligence before going to Mass, lest perchance anyone approach to the altar unworthily: for the altar is the tribunal of Christ, and His Body even there with His Blood judges those who approach unworthily." Can anything be clearer than this? Our Catholic fathers of the sixth century, like their descendants today, were accustomed to purge themselves from their sins in the Sacrament of Penance, in order to worthily receive what we and they believe to be the true and living Body of the Son of God.

Among other evidences given us in this matter of belief in the Real Presence there is a precious liturgical relic of our ancient Irish Church. I mean the "Antiphonary of Bangor." This venerable Irish choral-book has been proved by Dr. Todd to belong to the seventh century. It contains a communion hymn, which appears to have been known and chanted in the churches of

Erinn long before the time of its transcription into this venerable old manuscript. This "Hymn while the priests communicate," as it calls itself, contains eleven stanzas, the first and fifth of which are here subjoined:

(1) "Approach ye holy ones : Receive the Body of Christ : Drinking the Sacred Blood by which you were redeemed."

(5) "For the whole world the Lord is lifted up : He is at the same time High-Priest and Victim."

From all this we must necessarily conclude that the early Irish Church both believed in the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, and regarded it as a salutary *sacrifice* offered up to the Eternal Father. I regret that space prevents my quoting more of this ancient hymn. For beauty of thought, simplicity and force of diction, as well as for clear and precise exposition of Catholic doctrine, it might well compare with the Eucharistic outpourings of the Angelic Doctor.

That our Irish Catholic ancestors were devout to the Virgin Mary, that in common with the Universal Church then as now they believed her to be the purest of all God's creatures, endowed with unique and peerless privileges, such as befit the ineffable dignity of Mother of God, our early Church MSS. afford abundant and conclusive proof. The *Leabhar Breac* contains a beautiful Litany of the Blessed Virgin, which O'Curry estimates to belong to the middle of the eighth century, if not earlier. This great old Irish prayer sets forth the exalted privileges of Our Blessed Lady in such a charmingly poetic strain that one might take it to be a translation of some Oriental eulogy, were it not tempered and chastened into such a sweetly pathetic invocation as only the old Gaelic tongue is capable of. It begins: "*O Great Mary, O Mary, Greatest of Marys.*" Amongst the later invocations we have "*O Blessed and Most Blessed, O Gate of Heaven,*" "*O Golden Casket,*" "*O Couch of Love and Mercy,*" "*O Destruction of Eve's Disgrace,*" "*O Enclosed Garden,*" "*O Closely Locked Fountain,*" "*O Perpetual Virgin,*" "*O Mother of God.*" Then follows a beautiful prayer to this "Powerful Mistress of Heaven and Earth," imploring the aid of her intercession with Christ. The most cursory examination of this old Litany must convince every candid mind that the ancient Irish believed

in Mary's perpetual virginity, her *immaculate sinlessness*, her powerful influence over her Divine Son, and her transcendent dignity and preëminence amongst all the saints in heaven. The reader will find a translation of it in Cardinal Moran's *Essays on the Early Irish Church.* Let him imagine, if he can, how much it has lost in beauty and music by its translation from the melodious old tongue in which it was composed, and in which it was wont to be recited by our ancestors at Irish altars and at Irish hearths more than a thousand years ago. Nor is this old Litany our only witness. There are Irish prayers and hymns innumerable of ancient date to testify the love and reverence of our fathers for the Immaculate Virgin Mother. Children of both sexes they used to place under her protection, by giving them the name *Maelmaire*, or *Servant of Mary*, and the highest title of respect they could confer on the great St. Bridget was to name her "the Mary of Erinn."

Of the ancient Irish liturgical treatises that have come down to us, by far the most valuable in point of antiquity and authority are the MSS. known as the Stowe and the Bobbio Missal. I invite special attention to these old relics of our early Irish Church, as proving her acceptance, not of one or two, but of practically *all the leading Catholic doctrines* to-day rejected by our separated brethren. The Stowe Missal has been adjudged, as Dr. Todd in an interesting and erudite essay sets forth, to be in all probability the original missal of St. Ruadhan, founder of the monastery of Lorrha in Tipperary, who died in 584. The Bobbio Missal was discovered later in the seventeenth century in the famous Italian monastery, the greatest of all the foundations of St. Columbanus. Mabillon, the learned Benedictine who discovered and published it, was of opinion that it was written at least a thousand years before his time; while Dr. Lanigan and Cardinal Moran, after a minute examination of the subject, concluded that it was in all probability the very Missal used by St. Columbanus himself. Be that as it may, it is certainly an Irish Missal of the seventh century, and a copy of the Cursus Scotorum or liturgy brought to Ireland by St. Patrick. The ordinary of the Mass in the Stowe begins with a Litany of the Saints, wherein the Blessed Virgin and the Apostles are individually invoked. The canon of the Mass

is exactly the same as in our Catholic Missals to-day, the subsequent prayers "agreeing literally" (we quote from Dr. Todd), "with the canon down to the Memento for the dead." It contains besides, Masses in honor of the Apostles, of Martyrs, of Virgins, and (mark it) *a Mass for the Dead.* Now, according to one of our sturdiest opponents, this old Missal was written before the year 584. The plain conclusion is that the Irish Church, scarcely a century after St. Patrick's death, believed in the Real Presence and in Purgatory, prayed to the Saints, and prayed for the dead. And the evidence of the Stowe Missal is corroborated by the Bobbio Missal. The Canon of the Mass is almost word for word the same. There are Masses of St. Stephen, of the Apostles James and John, of St. John the Baptist, of St. Peter and St. Paul, of St. Martin of Tours, and of St. Michael the Archangel. It contains a Mass of the *Cathedra Sti. Petri;* a clear proof, if after all we have seen proof were wanted, of the devotion of the early Irish Church to the Apostolic Chair. There are also Masses of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and of the Finding of the Holy Cross, proving the belief of our fathers in that singular privilege of our Blessed Lady, as well as in the veneration for sacred relics, especially for the Holy Cross. Yet we are to believe, forsooth! that the Irish Church was identical with a sect whose leading lights to-day scoff at "Mariolatry," and spurn the sacred Symbol of Redemption with all the iconoclastic zeal of a Leo the Iaurian or a Constantine Copronymous. As already mentioned, the ancient Missals contain Masses for the Dead, for all the deceased generally, and for deceased priests; and if there could still be any room for doubting the belief of our fathers in Purgatory, it must vanish when we look at the prayers in the Stowe Missal. There we read: "Grant, we beseech thee, Omnipotent and Merciful God, that the souls of Thy servants may find the forgiveness of their sins and the joys of perpetual life;" while the Bobbio Missal, still more explicit, reads: "O Lord, grant him the remission of his offences, *in that mysterious abode where there is now no more room for repentance.*" The chief objection raised against the belief of the early Irish Church in the doctrine of Purgatory has been sought in the silence about this doctrine in an ancient tract entitled "De Tribus

Habitaculis" (*i. e.*, Heaven, Earth and Hell). This it has been found convenient to attribute to St. Patrick, although its authorship is so utterly uncertain as to find advocates on the one hand who ascribe it to St. Augustine, who died in 430, whilst others attribute it to St. Bernard, who died in 1153.

But why weary ourselves with quotations, since it must be plain to any unprejudiced mind that this theory of a Protestant early Irish Church is utterly untenable, if not quite inconceivable? If it were possible that St. Patrick, rejecting the doctrines instilled into his mind from childhood, proving false to the trust placed in him by St. Celestine, and establishing in Ireland a distinctively Protestant Church, independent of Rome, it would still remain an unaccountable mystery to the honest historian how this fact could have escaped the vigilance of the great churchmen of his time. During his apostolate, the Chair of Peter was filled by some of the ablest and most illustrious Pontiffs of the Ancient Church—Leo the Great, Hilary, and Gelasius. Would these "watchmen set on high" (as St. Columbanus would call them), or would the Papal Legate, St. Germanus, have stood calmly by and allowed without a word of protest, a bold heresiarch to sow the seeds of spiritual death amongst a still unregenerated people? Or could it be conceived that Ireland was the one oasis of pure Protestantism to be found in all Europe during the so-called Dark Ages, without that Church which had separated from the common fold being treated by the European Churches just as they treated the Nestorians and the Maronites of the East? She would have been shunned by them as an heretical and schismatical sect, with which no other Church would hold intercommunion. Is such a conclusion borne out by the facts of history? Assuredly not. On the contrary, there was during these ages the most intimate possible connection between the Irish and the Continental Churches. Those early ages represent the heyday of Ireland's glory, when she was known and acknowledged all over Christendom as the Island of Saints and Scholars, the sanctuary of Europe, and the school of the West. They were the ages when the noble youths and saintly ecclesiastics thronged from France and Germany, Spain, and Italy itself, to her world-famed schools, to drink in at its purest source the science of the Saints. Who has not heard of Bangor and

Clonmacnoise, of Lismore, Clonard and Clonfert? All Europe was flooded with saintly Irish missionaries, teaching, training, ruling the Church of God. At the very time when St. Patrick was preparing for his mission, and during the progress of that mission, a mighty change was coming over the face of the civilized world. The old empire of the Cæsars was being shattered to pieces 'neath the avenging arms of Alaric, Attila, and Genseric. All Europe was being overrun by semibarbarous tribes. Goths and Visigoths, Huns, Vandals, and Franks swept along like an irresistible torrent, laying waste the fairest plots in the vineyard of the Lord. Meantime, in the Providence of God, our Western Isle lay calm and peaceful, preparing for the great work which was soon to be hers, and affording a welcome asylum to all true lovers of learning and sanctity. When at length the storm had spent its strength, when new nations and new institutions sprang up from the ruins of pagan civilization, Ireland's work began. From her peaceful shores, wise men of God went forth, to found monasteries and schools, to preach and teach as Apostolic missionaries throughout Central and Northern Europe, from Iona and Lindisfarne, to Luxeuil and Bobbio. The great names of Columkille, Columbanus, Fridolin, Gall, Kilian, Livinus, Fursey, Colman, Scotus, are but the few more brilliant stars amid a host of others "darkened by excess of light." Nor were they merely monks, missionaries or teachers. Many of them ruled the Churches represented by the most important episcopal chairs in Europe. St. Arbogast became Bishop of Strasburg, St. Virgilius, Bishop of Saltzburg, in Germany; St. Frigidian was made Bishop of Lucca, and St. Carthagus, Bishop of Tarentum in Italy; many of the Sees of France and Switzerland were occupied by bishops of Irish birth and training. How can this most intimate connection between Ireland and the Continent in matters of religion be explained, if it were true that there were any essential doctrinal differences whatever between these men? Are we to believe that the clergy and laity of the Continent allowed the members of an heretical sect to instruct their children, to preach from their pulpits, to fill their episcopal chairs? If St. Columbanus raised against himself such a storm of opposition merely because he ventured to differ from his Continental neighbors about such

a comparatively trifling matter of discipline, such as the exact time of keeping Easter, how would he and the other Irish missionaries have been treated had they been found in error on the most fundamental dogmas of Catholic doctrine? How could we interpret those remarkable words of the same great Columbanus to the Bishops of Gaul: "Pray for us, since *we are all members of the one body*, whether Gauls, Britons, or Irish"?

Nor does history preserve for us any vestige of so momentous a revolution as is implied in the assertion that Ireland departed at any time from the pure faith taught her children by St. Patrick. If our ancient annalists have handed down to us every phase and circumstance of the trifling disciplinary controversies, such as the Paschal question, with full accounts of the letters written about them, and of the disputations and synods held to settle them, can it be conceived that they would have passed over in silence changes involving the most fundamental and practical questions of faith and morality? To the unbiassed mind seeking for a straightforward answer to these questions, the conviction must come that a Protestant St. Patrick and a Protestant early Irish Church are the merest creations of a distorted and prejudiced imagination.

JAMES J. MCNAMEE.

St. Macarthen's Seminary,
Monaghan, Ireland.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

IT is a common complaint against the dogmatic definitions of the Catholic Church that they are additions to the original simplicity of the Faith. Arius rejected the Homoöusion because he maintained it was absent from the writings of the primitive fathers; Protestants on similar grounds reject Transubstantiation as defined at Trent. They confuse a new *term* with a new *doctrine*, forgetting that, while the expression of a truth may sound unfamiliar, the truth itself may have been held from the beginning. Each age has its own language, its own religious difficulties and misconceptions; and the Church of Christ, if she would fulfil adequately her office of Divine Teacher of men, must adopt the

message so as to make it intelligible to her hearers. She makes use of human terminology to bring home to the mind the true meaning of the particular supernatural truth which was in danger of being lost in a sea of wordy sophistries, without impairing by an iota the integrity of the Sacred Deposit committed to her care.

It is because they have never grasped this elementary principle, that so many outside the Church have misunderstood the precise force of her definitions. It has seemed to them that the sum of Revealed Truth was being unwarrantably increased, or particular doctrines arbitrarily circumscribed within the "narrow limits of a lifeless formula" (as they say, forgetting that every doctrine, however transcendental and spiritual, must be expressed in language if it is to convey any meaning to the mind), when all the time the true object of Creeds, Canons, and Conciliar Decrees, was to preserve the Faith in its simplicity, and to meet the attacks of heresy by barriers erected round the citadel. The Church has fought her enemies with their own weapons, using the language of each age to illustrate the true, as opposed to the false, interpretation of her message, taking up one terminology after another (as occasion might require), confronting heretical expressions of belief by orthodox, inaccurate *formulae* by precise statements of the various points of Revelation that were assailed. "Speculative activity [Mr. W. Ward well says] led to new deviations from the orthodox tradition. As these took form and became precise, the Church's own language, in order to exclude them, had perforce to become more precise."[1]

We have a striking illustration, in recent times, of such misunderstanding on the part of two non-Catholics occupying a high official position when we find the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in their reply to the *Vindication of the Bull Apostolicae Curae* by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and his Suffragans, triumphantly stigmatizing the Tridentine decree on Transubstantiation as "a metaphysical definition, expressed in terms of mediæval philosophy . . . unknown to the Church in the earliest ages of its history."

It is the purpose of the present paper to examine this statement in the light of history, and see how far the accusation of

[1] *Life of Wiseman*, ii, p. 536 (ed. 3).

novelty can fairly be made against the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.

What, then, is this "metaphysical definition . . . unknown to the Church in the earliest ages of its history"?

All that the Council of Trent laid down on the subject is contained in Session XIII, cap. 4 (*de Transubst.*) and can. 2.

In the first reference, the words run:—"Quoniam . . . Christus . . . corpus suum id quod sub specie panis offerebat, vere esse dixit, id persuasum semper in ecclesiâ Dei fuit, idque nunc denuo sancta haec Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiae panis in substantiam corporis Christi . . . et totius substantiae vini in substantiam sanguinis eius. Quae conversio convenienter et proprie a sanctâ catholicâ ecclesiâ transubstantiatio est appellata."

In the Canon the same words are repeated under anathema, with the addition of the important clause "*manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini*"—"only the *species* (or natural phenomena) of bread and wine remaining."

It will be perceived that the framers of the definition expressly disclaim any novelty of doctrine: the Sacred Synod does no more than affirm afresh (*denuo*) what has "ever been the persuasion of the Church of God." We proceed to see if their contention is verified in fact.

In one sense it can hardly be denied that Transubstantiation was no new thing. There is a direct continuity between the definition of the Fourth Council of the Lateran in 1215 and that of the Council of Trent in 1551. It will suffice to place the two in parallel columns, for us to see this:—

LATERAN DECREE.	TRIDENTINE DECREE.
"In quâ (Ecclesiâ) idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium J. C., cuius corpus et sanguis in Sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, *transubstantiatis* pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divinâ."	"Persuasum semper in ecclesiâ Dei fuit . . . per consecrationem panis et vini *conversionem* fieri *totius substantiae* panis in substantiam corporis Xti Dni nostri, et totius substantiae vini in substantiam sanguinis eius Quae *conversio* convenienter et proprie . . . *transubstantiatio* est appellata."

The crucial words in the one definition are "cuius corpus et sanguis . . . sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem," and in the other "conversionem fieri totius substantiae panis in substantiam corporis Christi . . . et totius substantiae vini in substantiam sanguinis eius," and they mutually correspond, and are essentially the same. It is idle to draw deductions—as the Rev. W. K. Firminger, an able and learned Anglican theologian, has done[2]—from the fact that Innocent III, who presided over the Lateran Council, wrote, as a private individual, in his work on the Eucharist: "*Verum an partes in partes, an totum in totum, an totale in totale, novit Ille qui facit. Ego quod residuum comburo*"—and to conclude that loose views as to the substantial conversion may be allowably read into the Lateran definition. To argue thus is surely to forget that the words of the decree bear a meaning accepted by all at the time, and must be taken in their objective sense. The Pope as a private theologian is one thing; the Pope as Vicar of Christ, the organic Head of the whole Christian Body, promulgating in conjunction with it a statement of the Faith, is quite another. There is a direct connection between the phraseology of the Lateran Council and that of the Tridentine. The latter definition is included implicitly in the former, and is in effect equivalent to it. The fuller "*conversio totius substantiae*, etc.," is in truth no more that a preciser rendering of the simple "*transubstantiatis pane*, etc."

So too with the decree of the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century:—"Substantia panis in corpus, substantia vini in sanguinem (Christi) convertitur." What is the definition at Trent but an echo of the confession of unity at Florence, where we find the Greeks in perfect agreement with the Latins on the doctrine of the sacramental presence,—Archbishop Bessarion, of Nicaea, solemnly professing in the name of the rest, that "since we hear from all the most holy doctors of the Church, especially from St. John Chrysostom, that the Lord's words are those which *change and transmute* the bread into the true Body of Christ, . . . we follow the opinion of St. John Chrysostom as to the necessity" (*scil.* of the words of Institution).[3] In another sense,

[2] *Guardian*, April 6, 1898, p. 533.

[3] Mansi, *Conc.* 31, 1045, seq.

moreover, there was no novelty in the Tridentine dogma. If we take England as a typical Catholic country—and in some respects its evidence is more valuable than that of a Southern and naturally believing land—we find the words of the Fathers of Trent reproduced again and again in pre-Reformation times. As early as the beginning of the eighth century we find the Venerable Bede teaching as a matter of course that the bread and wine are "transferred" into the Body and Blood of Christ. Lanfranc, later on, teaches plainly Transubstantiation in his treatise *De Eucharistiae Sacramento*,[4] and St. Anselm uses the phrase "panem *migrare* in Corpus Xti."[5] An even more significant witness appears in the person of Archbishop Arundel, who formulated, as the mouthpiece of Convocation in A.D. 1413, the following test declaration of the belief of the *Ecclesia Anglicana:* "The sayth and determination of Holy Church touchying the blissfull Sacrament of the Auter is this: That after the Sacramentall wordes be sayde by a prest in hys masse, the material bred, that was bifore, is turned into Christ's verray body, and the material wyn that was bifore, is turned into Christ's verray blode, and so there leveth [remaineth] on the auter, no more material brede, ne material wyne, the wych were there bifore the saying of the wordes."[6] This is only a repetition of a similar formula put forth authoritatively in A.D. 1382, by Convocation under Archbishop Courtenay. It is thus summarized in an instructive leading article which appeared recently in the *Tablet* newspaper:[7] "At the largest and most authoritative Doctrinal Commission assembled in the English Church before the Reformation the doctrine of Transubstantiation was reaffirmed by the Primate and six bishops, fourteen doctors of Civil and Canon Law, and twenty-three of the most eminent theologians of England, with the full approval of the whole English Church, in these words: The statement that the 'substance of material bread and wine remain in the Sacrament of the Altar after consecration' was condemned as

[4] *Cf.* Lanfranc, *de Corp. et Sang. Dni*:—"Credimus terrenas Substantias . . . ineffabiliter . . . *converti* in essentiam dominici corporis, reservatis ipsorum rerum speciebus." (c. 18.)

[5] St. Anselm, *in ep. de Corp. et Sang. Dni.*

[6] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii, 355.

[7] *Tablet*, April 23, 1898.

'heresy.'[8] And Lord Cobham was subsequently sent to the stake for affirming it." That this doctrine was unquestionably the generally accepted orthodox teaching, is plain from the fact that the University of Oxford, which occupied much the same official position as the Sorbonne in later times, being the formally accredited theological *magisterium* of the English Church, in a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Suffragans of his Province, at a somewhat later period, condemned as "heretical" the doctrine that "the substance of bread remains on the altar after consecration, and ceases not to be bread."[9] The actual Lateran definition of A.D. 1215 was reproduced by the national council of Exeter—representing the entire *Ecclesia Anglicana* in A.D 1287, which bade the faithful adore the Sacrament of the Altar, because "by the words '*Hoc est*, etc.,' and by no other, the bread is *transubstantiated* into the Body of Christ." And the Northern provincial Council assembled at Durham in the early part of the same century, even anticipated the actual words of the Tridentine definition, when it declared that in the Sacrament "under the *species* of bread and wine, the bread is by the Divine power *transubstantiated* into His Body and the wine into His Blood."

It is, therefore, abundantly proved that the decree of Trent is in a relative sense the promulgation of no new-fangled theory, but the assertion of a truth current for many centuries previously. Can this be said also *absolutely* and without any qualification? Were the Fathers of Trent true to history and fact in their assumption that they are only stating, in clearer language it may be, but none the less, "*quod semper in Ecclesiâ Dei persuasum fuit?*" In other words, is Transubstantiation—the conversion of the constituent element of bread into the formal principle of the Body of Christ—clearly seen to be a primitive Christian truth taught throughout the ages?

We may dismiss the consideration of the second half of the definition—that relating to the continuous reality of the accidents—as comparatively unimportant since our opponents do not question its truth. If, then, it can be shown that the remaining

[8] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii, 157.
[9] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii, 344.

and principal part of the decree—the substantial change at consecration—was taught invariably and formally, without hesitation or ambiguity, from the earliest times, as much by schismatics from St. Peter's See as by those united to it, in liturgies and in the tomes of the Fathers, as well as in catechisms and in formal treatises, we think that the contention of the two Archbishops will fall completely to the ground.

We begin our demonstration with a testimony whose authority Anglicans will be the last to discount. The Eastern Churches, so conservative in their discipline and ritual, so grandly tenacious in their grasp of dogmatic truth, though separated for 1000 years from the Apostolic Chair—the God-given centre of unity—bear witness to the true doctrine of that Holy See "to which," as St. Cyprian says, "faithlessness can have no access." [10] In the "Orthodox Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Churches of the East," drawn up in A. D., 1643, question LXVI runs thus: "Our Lord is also present upon earth in a sacramental manner by *Transubstantiation* (*κατὰ μετουσιώσιν*), since the substance (*οὐσία*) of the bread is changed into the substance of His Holy Body, and the substance of the wine into the substance of the Precious Blood."[11] Our second testimony to the same effect is the Council of Bethlehem held in A.D. 1672, which stated (*a*) that "after consecration the bread and wine are transmuted, transubstantiated, converted, transformed (*μεταβάλλεσθαι, μετουσιοῦσθαι, μεταποιεῖσθαι, μεταῤῥυθμίζεσθαι*), the bread into the Lord's Body which was born at Bethlehem . . . and the wine into the Blood which flowed from His side upon the Cross."[12] (*b*) That "after the consecration . . . the very true bread and wine no longer remain [in Greek original of 1672[13] the words run "*the substance of bread and wine no longer remains*"], but the very Body and Blood of our Lord under the appearance of bread and wine [the Greek original adds: '*that is to say*, under the accidents (*τά βεβηκότα*) of the bread."][14] (*c*) That "when we use the word

[10] *In ep.* 1ª *ad Cornel*, xiv.

[11] Rev. J. H. Blunt's *Dict. of Doctr. and Hist. Theol.*, 1871, p. 760.

[12] Canon xvii.

[13] V. Kimmel's *Mon. Fid. Eccl. Orient.*, i, p. 458.

[14] Dr. J. M. Neale, *Hist. of Eastern Church*, General *Introd.*, ii, p. 1173.

Transubstantiation (μετουσίωσις) we by no means think it explains the mode by which the bread and wine are converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, for this is altogether incomprehensible . . . but we mean that the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord, not figuratively or symbolically, nor by any extraordinary grace attached to them . . . but . . . the bread becomes (γίνεται) verily and indeed and substantially the very true Body of the Lord, and the wine the very Blood of the Lord."[15]

The binding authority of this Synod of Bethlehem over the Russian Church having of late been called in question,[16] the testimony of Provost Maltzen (the learned translator into German of the *Acta* of the Council) is important. "It is not permissible [he writes] for a particular Church, such as the Russian, to depart in any point whatsoever . . . from the doctrine which is contained in the official Confessions of the whole Orthodox Eastern Church, the original Greek text of which [confessions] is sanctioned by the authority of the most holy Patriarchs. The doctrines therein contained are, without exception, unchangeable *dogmas* of the infallible *magisterium* of the Holy Church—of that *magisterium* which is inspired by the Holy Ghost and exercised by the divinely instituted hierarchy, and of that Church which can neither deceive nor be deceived. In regard to all these dogmas there prevails among all the particular Orthodox Churches an *absolute agreement*, and any departure, however slight, from these Confessions—the *Confessio Orthodoxa* [of 1643]; the Decrees of the Orthodox Patriarch [of Bethlehem in 1672], and the Larger Christian Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church [of 1868] must be regarded as nothing less than heresy."[17]

No one can have the hardihood to say that this is a new and strange doctrine on the part of the Churches of Constantinople

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *V. Cardinal Vaughan and the Russian Church*, by Prof. Collins and W. J. Birkbeck (London, 1897), in which it is argued that the Russian Church does not accept the doctrine expressed in the original Greek text already referred to, of the decrees of the Synod of Bethlehem.

[17] "*Bitt-, Dank-, und Weihe-Gottesdienste der Orthodox-Kathol. Kirche des Morgenlandes*," p. ci. Dedicated to M. Probedonoszen, Procurator of the Holy Synod.

and Moscow. The unchanging East is free at all events from all suspicion of novelty; it changes not with the changeful years. What she teaches to-day she claims to have ever taught; her definitions in the seventeenth century contain nothing different from the standard of Faith of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, to whose authority she appeals as final. And this doctrine is seen to be identical with that defined at Trent.

We turn next to the Liturgies of primitive Christendom. Here, if anywhere, we will find the true doctrine unmixed with any alloy of human invention. *Lex credendi: lex orandi*—the law of Faith must ever be the law of prayer, but especially in that form of prayer which is the highest and divinest of all, concerned, as it is, with the Representation on earth of the Sacrifice of our Ransom, mirroring below the perfect intercession in the Courts of Heaven, of the Lamb slain in mystery from the foundation of the world.

Now, in the most ancient Liturgies, according to Perrone,[18] there is this common feature—they contain an Invocation of the Holy Ghost, whereby He is implored to "*change and transmute* by His Almighty power these proffered gifts, and to *make* them the Body and Blood of Christ." In proof of this statement we will cite the Gothic, Ethiopian, and Alexandrian, and those of SS. Chrysostom and Basil, italicizing the crucial words in each:—

1. *Gothic:* "May the Paraclete descend that we may receive the bread *changed* by Thy operative power, and in the chalice partake of the cup *turned* into the Blood which flowed from Thy side on the cross."

2. *Ethiopian:* "Show Thy Face upon this, Thy spiritual altar; bless, sanctify, and purify [these oblations]; and *transmute* this bread that it may become Thy stainless Body. . . ."[19]

3. *Alexandrian:* "Send down upon us and upon these breads and upon these chalices, Thy Holy Spirit, that He may consecrate and consummate them as the Omnipotent God, and that He

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 301.

[19] In so-called "Universal Canon." The Ethiopian word rendered "transmute" bears the meaning, according to Ludolph's lexicon, of a true change of one thing into another. Renaudot is emphatic on this point, adding "si vel levissima de eius significatione esset dubitatis, vox Coptica, cui respondit, et versiones Arabicae illam plane discuterent." (*Collectio Liturgiar. Orient.*, p. 527.)

may *make* [ποιήση] the bread the Body and the chalice the Blood of the New Testament, of Him our Lord and God and Saviour and Universal King, Jesus Christ."[20]

4. *St. Chrysostom:* Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα τὸν ἅγιον ἄρτον "Bless, O Lord, the holy bread, saith the Deacon; hereupon the priest saith 'Make (ποιήσον) this bread the venerable Body of Thy Christ.' The priest, after being called by the deacon to bless the wine, saith, '*Make* what is contained in this chalice the venerable Blood of Christ.' Then over both the priest saith: '*Converting* (μεταβαλλών) them through Thy Holy Spirit.'"[21]

5. *St. Basil* has the same form, with even a verbal coincidence.[22]

Apart from this "*illapsu*" of the Holy Spirit, we find mention of Transubstantiation in the Gelasian Sacramentary and in the Ambrosian Missal. The former contains a prayer said by the Bishop during the Ordination of Priests—"that Thou mayest *change* these gifts by (their) blessing into the Body and Blood of Thine Immaculate Son;" the latter has the petition "that (this service) may be to us a rightful Eucharist for the *transformation* of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Our third and last witness to the antiquity of the doctrine defined at Trent is that of the Fathers of the Church. Two remarks are necessary before we proceed to the examination of Patristic evidence. The first is, that we must not look for concise and accurate theological expression, proper to a later age, from those who lived in the happy days before heresy had made limitation of language a necessity. Controversialists would seem, in many instances, to expect us to find, if we are to make good our argument, the same terminology in the writings of SS. Irenæus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Ambrose, and Augustine, as that contained in the Tridentine decree, canon and catechism. They might as reasonably search for the ὁμοούσιον in the pages of Justin Martyr or of Tertullian. The dogmas of the community of an individual nature between Father and Son, and of the conversion of substance in the Eucharist were equally contained in the original

[20] Renaudot, *op. cit.*, p. 157.
[21] Goar, *Eucholog.*, p. 77.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

deposit of Revelation; but it needed Arius in the fourth century and the continental Reformers in the sixteenth to bring about the Creed of Nicæa and the definition of Trent with their clear and stereotyped *formulae*. All that is necessary for the proof of our thesis is to show that the primitive Fathers agreed *essentially and practically* with the Tridentine doctrine, in maintaining again and again as an article of Faith that could not be denied, a substantial conversion at consecration of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ.

Our second remark is like unto the first,—it is that we must not be surprised if we come across words and phrases which would seem at first sight to contradict, not merely the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but even of any Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. It should be a recognized principle in explaining such passages, that they must be interpreted in the light of their full context, and in harmony with the doctrine clearly taught at other times, either by the particular Father in question, or by others with whom he lived and died in communion. If we refuse to reconcile apparent discrepancies on the doctrine of the Eucharist in this way, we are arbitrarily taking a different course from that adopted in dealing with difficulties in Patristic writings to other doctrines of Revelation. No careful student of the Fathers would be so bold as to deny that there are passages which, if taken separately, and divorced from the orthodox teaching in other parts of the works of the same Father, would seem to cut the ground from under many cardinal doctrines of the Faith.[23] To give one or two instances. Calvin professed to go no further in his horrible teaching on Predestination than St. Augustine; and Jansenius, with certainly some show of reason, justified his doctrine on grace from the works of the same great doctor of the Universal Church.[24] We have no more right logically to expect to find less difficulties or apparent discrepancies in the teaching of the Fathers on the Eucharistic Presence, than when the Trinity, or the Atonement, or Grace, are in question. And we must adopt the same principle of interpretation in every case impartially.

[23] V. *Facundus hermian.* (*pro defens. trium.*, cap. 1, 6, c. 5.

[24] We have already alluded to the difficulties to the Homoöusion drawn from the writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. (V. especially Petavius *de Trin.*, i, 5, 2. Baur, *Dogmengeschichte*, i, 444, and Liddon, *Bampt. L.*, pp. 425-428, ed. 15.)

Having laid down these introductory *caveats*, we proceed to show in detail that alike in East and West, belief in a substantial conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ was stated by the Fathers in language that leaves no loophole for a disputed meaning. We have, first, such general *formulae*, repeated many times, as "bread and wine 'become,' 'are changed,' 'made,' 'transmuted,' 'pass,' into the Body of Christ," *e.g.*, *St. Cyril of Alexandria*—"*Changing* these oblations into the truth of His own Flesh."[25] *Eusebius emiss:* "The priest *changes* (*convertere*) by secret power visible creatures into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ."[26] *St. John Damascene:* "The bread itself and wine are *transmuted* into the Body and Blood of Christ."[27] *St. Ambrose:* "You say 'mine is common bread;' before the words of consecration that bread is indeed bread; but after consecration from bread it *becomes* the flesh of Christ."[28] The last-named Saint,[29] in common with *SS. Chrysostom*[30] and *Gregory of Nyssa*,[31] uses the "conversion" to denote the effect of the words of consecration on the elements. Tertullian,[32] with Origen,[33] says that the bread *becomes* (*fieri*) the Holy Body by prayer. *St. Augustine* says the same more at length: "The Body and Blood are made (*effici*) by the power of the Holy Ghost from the substance of bread and wine."[34] "The bread *passes* (*transire*) into the nature of the Lord's body."[35] And *St. Cyprian* and *Gaudentius brixianus* state respectively that "the bread [is] changed (*mutatus*) not in figure (*effigie*) but in nature,"[36] and that "from bread is made (*effici*) the Body, and from wine the Blood."[37]

2. Apart from these general expressions implying a substantial change, we find the teaching that the Eucharistic words are operative and powerful. "If," says *St. Ambrose*, "so great is the efficacy of the words of the Lord Jesus that things should begin to exist that had no existence, how much more operative are they

[25] *In ep. ad Colosyrium.*
[26] Hom. 5 de Pasch.
[27] *De orth. fid.*, l. 4, c. 4.
[28] *De Sacr.*, iv. 4.
[29] *Id.*, iv, 5 and vi, 1.
[30] *Hom. de Prod. Jud.* and *Hom. 82, 83 in Matth.*
[31] *Orat. Catech.*, c. 37. *Cf.* St. Chrysost. *de prod Jud.*, p. 63.
[32] *C. Marc* iv, 40.
[33] *C. Cels.* 8.
[34] *De Conscr.*, cap. *Utrum sub figuri*, etc., dist. 2.
[35] *Id.*
[36] *Serm. de Coenâ Dni.*
[37] *Tr. 2 in Exodo.*

to continue in being things that had existence, and *change them into another*.[38] "Before consecration," writes *St. Augustine*, "it [the element] is bread and wine, the produce of nature; but after consecration the Body and Blood of Christ, which the blessing consecrated."[39]

3. The Fathers adduce various analogies in nature to explain, however inadequately, the miraculous change. Thus *Gaudentius brix.* mentions by way of illustration the change of seeds into wheat, of moisture into wine;[40] and *John Damascene*, the physical change by whose power food is converted into human flesh and blood.[41]

4. They appeal to *miracles* to strengthen belief in the supernatural change that takes place in the Eucharist—*e. g. St. John Damascene* to the *creation*:—"If" [he writes] "the word of the Lord is living and powerful (Hebr. 4: 12); if heaven and earth, water, fire, and air, and all their ornament—not to speak of the noblest of animals called man—are perfected by the word of the Lord . . . why should He not be powerful enough to *make* finally also bread His Body and wine His Blood."[42] The same Saint, with *St. Justin*, to the *Incarnation*:—"If God the Word Himself [says the former] by His own will has made man, and compacted Flesh without any seed from the most pure . . . blood of the Virgin . . . why do you now ask how bread becomes (*fiat*) the Body of Christ? I reply that the Spirit overshadows and accomplishes that which surpasses speech and thought."[43] *St. Justin*:—"We do not receive these elements either as common bread or common drink, but as through the word of God Christ Jesus our Saviour was made Flesh, and so also we are taught that that food from which our flesh and blood are nourished by its conversion (into them), is both the Flesh and Blood of that Incarnate Jesus, after that nourishment is made the Eucharist by the prayer containing His Words."[44] *St. Cyril of Jerusalem* to the miracle at Cana, in the following earnest and striking words:—"When, therefore, he pronounced and said of bread: *This is My Body*, who shall dare afterwards to deny it? And when He Himself

[38] *De Sacr.*, iv, 4. [39] *De Consecr.*, c. 41, *dist.* 2. [40] *De Ex.*, 3, 2.
[41] *Op. cit.*, iv, 13, *cf.* St. Greg. Nyss., *Orat. cat.*, c. 37.
[42] *De. fid. orth.*, 1, iv, c. 13. [43] *Ibid.* [44] *Apol.* i, 65.

asserted and said: *This is My Blood*, who ever doubted, saying it was *not* His Blood? He changed (*transmutavit*) of old water into wine (which is like unto blood), at Cana of Galilee, and shall we deem Him less worthy of our belief, when He changed (*transmutavit*) wine into His own Blood?"[45]

5. In addition to these classified quotations, we append a few others which bear witness not less clearly to the same doctrine:—*Tertullian*:—"Taking bread He *made* it into His Body."[46] *St. Ambrose*—"Before consecration, it is called something else; after consecration it is named Blood, and thou sayst 'Amen,' *i. e.* 'It is true.'"[47] *St. Cyril of Jerusalem*:—"We are fully persuaded that what seems bread, though bread by taste, but the Body of Christ; and that what seems wine, is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the Blood of Christ."[48] *Theodoret*:—"It [the bread] *is changed* by a wonderful operation, though to us it *appears* bread . . . Bread indeed it appears to us, but Flesh in fact (τῷ ὄντι) it is."[49] The Syrian, *St. James of Sarug*:—"From the point of time when He took bread and called it His Body it was not bread but His Body."[50]

Against these testimonies, so clear, unambiguous, unanimous, to the antiquity of the Tridentine decree as to a conversion after consecration of that which makes bread to be bread, into the heavenly reality which is the Body of the Redeemer, it is useless to urge in contradiction passages in which it is stated that the "nature" or "substance" of bread remains after the advent of the Presence—*e. g. St. Chrysostom*:—"As before the bread is consecrated we call it bread; but when the Divine Grace has . . . consecrated it, it is no longer called bread, but is considered worthy of the name of the Lord's Body, *although the nature of bread remains in it*"[51]—or a comparison is made between the

[45] *Catech. myst.*, iv, 1, 2. The whole of this section of St. Cyril's Catechism of Instruction is well worthy of attention. The Bishop of Clifton has referred to it at length in his Advent Pastoral of 1898.

[46] *Adv. Marc.*, iv, 40.

[47] *De Sacr.*, iv, 4, *cf. De consec.*, dist. 2.

[48] *Op. cit.*, xxii, 9, *cf. id.*, iv, 6.

[49] *Hom. in Matth.*, xxvi, 26.

[50] Serm. 66, *de Pass. Dni.*

[51] *In ep. ad Caesar*: Cf. *Gelasius* Max. Bibl. Vet. Patr., vol. viii, Lugd. 1677; *S. Ephrem. Antioch.* apud Photii Bibl. Cod. 229. *Theodoret*, Dial., vol. iv, Hal. 1772; *Facundus herm.*, L. ix, defens. 3, c. 5.

change in the Eucharist and the change in the other Sacraments, as though they were on the same plane—*e.g. St. Cyril Hier.* :—"For just as the bread of the Eucharist after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit is no more common bread, but the Body of Christ, so this ointment is no more bare ointment, nor to be called common after the Invocation, but is the grace of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, endowed with special energy by the Presence of His Godhead."[52]

In the first case, it is assumed wrongly that by the words "nature" and "substance" the Fathers cited, writing centuries before heresies had made accurate definition and precise terminology necessary, intended to mean what the Tridentine Fathers meant by them. This is demonstrably untrue. The words 'substance' and 'nature' are synonymous with what at Trent were called the 'species' or 'accidents.' This is surely evident (*a*) from the context of the various passages, where a *conversion* (μεταβολήν), to use Theodoret's word, of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, is mentioned; (*b*) from the fact that they constantly and uniformly speak of such 'nature' and 'substance' as *symbols*; (*c*) from Leibnitz' (a Protestant authority) well-known observation that the Fathers do not use these terms to express metaphysical notions.[53] (*d*) As regards Theodoret, from the confession of the Lutherans of Madgeburg that he is opposed to their doctrine and cannot be read with safety.[54] It should be added that the passages attributed to Theodoret and St. Gelasius occur in works that are considered spurious by many competent critics.

As to the second difficulty—that drawn from the supposed parallel in patristic writings, between the change in the Eucharist and the change in the other Sacraments—the simple distinction between a *substantial* and an *accidental* change will be found to be clearly made by the Fathers in question, and to separate as by an impassable gulf the change of Transubstantiation from that which occurs in Baptism and the rest of the Sacraments. By a substantial change we mean one by which the ultimate and basal

[52] *Op. cit.*, 3, n. 3.

[53] *In system. Theol.*, ed. 2, Raess et Weiss, Moguntiae, 1825, p. 220.

[54] *Centuria*, vi, c. 10.

reality in a thing which *makes* it that thing and nothing else—*e.g.*, *bread*, and not a plant,—is changed into another ultimate reality, —so that what a moment previously was bread becomes the Body of Christ; by an accidental change, we mean any change that does not touch that ultimate constituent reality but only adds to it some perfection. Thus, when the Fathers say (*passim*) that man by grace becomes an angel, they do not mean to imply a *substantial* change, by virtue of which man ceases to be man, but only an *accidental* change, by which he obtains certain angelic qualities, such as purity, spirituality, and the like. Now St. Cyril, in the passage quoted, and other Fathers clearly show that they have this very important distinction in mind. They are always careful to state that the term or object of the change, when the Eucharist is in question, is something *substantial*—a totally fresh reality—nothing less than the Body of Christ;—while the term or object of the change in the other Sacraments is something *accidental*—a property whereby they cease to be common and earthly elements, and become holy and consecrated vehicles of grace. So when St. Cyril says in the first part of the sentence: "The Eucharistic bread after the Invocation . . . is no more common bread but *the Body of Christ*," he conveys the idea, as clearly as language will allow, of such a change as has for its end an ultimate reality, distinct from, and succeeding, a former ultimate reality,—a change, in other words, that is *substantial;* and when later on he says "this holy (ointment) is no more bare ointment, but is the grace of Christ and of the Spirit, made powerful by the presence of His Godhead," he does not mean to imply that the ointment changes its nature so that it becomes, *e.g.*, the Holy Ghost, but only that it receives an added perfection—from being common, bare ointment, it becomes the channel of a supernatural gift; or, in other words, that an *accidental* and not a substantial change takes place.[55]

A third point freely urged against the Patristic argument for Transubstantiation is that there are several passages in which the sacred mysteries are called after consecration "bread" and "wine." This objection is based upon a misunderstanding. It would be perfectly legitimate to use such language at the present

[55] *Cf.* Hurter, *Medul. Theol. Dogm.*, n. 1056, note 1 (d).

day—as is indeed not infrequently the case—and it could be argued with an equal show of reason that modern Catholic theologians do not believe in Transubstantiation because they so speak of the Blessed Sacrament. The explanation is very simple. It must be remembered that the Eucharist is composed of two parts —a visible, which is contained in sensible phenomena, forces, and effects—such as size, color, sapidity, mass, force of resistance, power of nutrition, and the like,—and an invisible, wholly beyond the sphere of nature and the confines of sense—to wit, the Body and Blood of Christ; and since a composite object can rightly be called now by the one component element, now by the other, and again by both, so we find in the writings of the Fathers, just as in the popular manuals of devotion and in the pages of theologians of to-day, the Sacrament of the Altar designated at one time "bread," at another "the Body of Christ," and at a third "the Bread of Heaven, "the Sacrament of the Body of Christ." It is, therefore, obviously quite unreasonable to argue that because there are passages in which the Fathers speak of the Holy Eucharist as "bread," or even as "a type or symbol of the Body of Christ," it must be concluded that they deny the *res substantialiter contenta* under the objective forms of bread and wine.[56]

We may conclude our long survey of liturgies and patristic tomes, with the significant admission of the Protestant writer Leibnitz: "Antiquity [he says] has openly enough declared that bread is changed into the Body of Christ and wine into His Blood; and here and there, ancient Fathers acknowledged a μεταστοιχειῶσις, which Latins have rightly rendered 'Transubstantiation.'"[57]

The Tridentine statement of Eucharistic doctrine, denounced at Lambeth as "a metaphysical definition, unknown to the Church in the earliest stages of her history," is shown to have been the teaching current from the most primitive times. We find an unbroken *catena* of witnesses testifying to the truth of a substantial conversion of the bread and wine into the very Body and Blood of Christ, and their testimony is linked to that of the Litur-

[56] These three objections were raised in the *Guardian* of April 6 and April 20, 1898, and answered by the present writer on the same lines as he has adopted now in the numbers for April 13 and May 4, 1898.

[57] *Op. et loc. antea cit. Cf. Id.*, p. 224.

gies and Sacramentaries which enshrined the law of Faith in the utterance of Prayer.

Because the *expression* of the doctrine is formulated with more accuracy and precision in the face of the many wild statements and hazardous speculations of heresy, it does not follow that the *doctrine itself* is altered, but rather safeguarded from attack, and its foundations made doubly sure. The Fathers of Trent were no creators of novelty; they merely crystallized in set form the unsystematized but universally accepted doctrine of all the Christian ages. It need not distress us if Bishop Gore's statement[58] be true that "the word 'transubstantiare' is first . . . found in Stephen of Autun (*circa* A. D. 1112–1139), *Tract. de Sacr. Altaris*, cap. 14 (P. L. CLXXII., p. 1293), any more than Mr. Wilfrid Ward's admission that "the semi-Arians could unanswerably claim the language of early Fathers as in harmony with their own expressions"[59] should make us suspect novelty in the Nicene definition of the Consubstantiality of the Eternal Son.

The Tridentine decree no more bears the mark of unprimitiveness because it speaks in the language of the schoolmen, than the Homoöusion of Nicaea, although the latter pronounced the shibboleth of a section of Greek philosophers. "If," aptly remarks an Anglican writer,[60] "we condemn the Tridentine definition . . . we must on the same ground condemn the Nicene definition, which was expressed in the novel terms of contemporary philosophy, and the greater part of the *Quicunque vult*, which is expressed in terms of the Boethian metaphysics." The Catholic Church did not at Nicaea cut herself adrift from traditions of the past—from St. Clement of Alexandria, SS. Justin, Lactantius, and Tertullian—because she adopted the ὁμοούσιον, a word of which many saints and some local councils[61] had fought shy; she

[58] *Dissertations*, *Transubst. and Nihilianism*, p. 268, note 2.

[59] *Op. antea cit.*, p. 535. He adds: "This point, a favorite one with Newman, has, more recently, been urged by the Abbé Duchesne." *Cf.* Petavius, *de Trin.*, i, 5, 2. Liddon, *Bampton Lectures* (ed. 15), p. 528. *Vide* especially St. Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, 1, 7, nn. 2, 3; St. Justin M., *Dial. c. Tryph.*, caps 56, 126.

[60] The Rev. T. A. Lacey in *Guardian*, March 30, 1898.

[61] The classical instance is the Catholic Council held at Antioch sixty years before the Council of Nice. "Even the Fathers of Antioch had rejected the phrase homoousios, which the Council of Nicaea now ruled as obligatory." (Wilfrid Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 535. *Cf.* Dr. Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, ed. 15, p. 435.)

did not at Trent belie her connection and continuity with the Church of Pentecost because she adopted the 'barbarous term' Transubstantiation, of which SS. Peter and Paul were ignorant. She merely enshrined her doctrine in a new casket, or, in plain language, gave a new name to a very old truth, held and taught from the beginning. She explains more fully, as misunderstanding arises, her already existing belief—whether in the perfect equality of nature between Father and Son, or in the substantial Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist—giving greater exactness and precision to the original idea which was liable to be lost or denied in speculative explanation. "The formulae were new, but the seeds of the doctrines had been there from the first."[62]

W. R. CARSON.

Shefford, England.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.

IV.

IT is urged that St. Augustine contradicts the ancient tradition respecting the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol.[1] The passage to which appeal is made occurs in a homily on the Symbol, and runs as follows: "The words you have heard are scattered here and there in the Sacred Scriptures, but have thence been gathered and put into one formula."[2] Now, the tradition has it that the Apostles composed the Symbol on the eve of their dispersion, which took place before the books of the New Testament were written. Hence the passage in question runs counter to the tradition.

One way of meeting this difficulty, undoubtedly a grave difficulty because of the great authority of St. Augustine, would be to make the Saint mean by Sacred Scriptures the Old Testament only. But this would be rather an evading of the difficulty, for the expression "Sacred Scriptures" includes the New Testament

[62] W. Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 536.

[1] *Dogma, Gerarchia e Culto*, p. 322.

[2] Verba quae audistis per divinas Scripturas sparsa sunt, sed inde collecta et ad unum redacta. *De Symb. ad Catech.* Migne, tom. 6, col. 627.

as well as the Old. It is more than doubtful, too, whether all the words of the Symbol are to be found in the Old Testament. The words "under Pontius Pilate," at any rate, are not. Happily there is a better way.

First of all, let us see what St. Augustine says in his other sermons on the Symbol. Two of those given in the fifth volume of Migne's edition of the Saint's works, namely, 212 and 214, are unquestionably genuine. In both of these it is not the words of the Symbol but the doctrine which St. Augustine says is contained in the Scriptures. Nor does he say or in any way imply that the doctrine was taken from the Scriptures in the first instance. "All that you are about to hear in the Symbol," he tells his catechumens, "is contained in the Scriptures." And again: "This, then, is the Symbol, with the contents of which you have been made familiar already through the Scriptures and the preaching of the Church."[3] He opens his mind even more fully in the other sermon.[4] "The truths," he there tells his hearers, "which you are about to receive in a compendious form, to be committed to memory and orally professed, are not new to you nor unheard. For in the Sacred Scriptures and in the ecclesiastical discourses you have been wont to find them set forth in many ways." St. Augustine plainly does not mean here that the authors of the Symbol picked the words which compose it from various parts of the Scriptures—an utterly unlikely thing, in any case. Nor does he even mean that they actually took the truths embodied in it from the Scripture, where, of course, they are to be found, with many other truths besides. He simply means that catechumens could learn and did learn from the Scripture, as well as from the preaching of the Church, all the truths contained in the Symbol, long before the Symbol itself was given to them.

But, it will still be urged, in the homily which is entitled *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, it is declared in set terms, as cited above, that the very words of the Symbol were taken from the Scriptures. Granted; but it is only so much the worse for the homily that a thing so improbable should be affirmed in it. That homily has too long masqueraded under the great name of Augus-

[3] Serm. 212.

[4] Serm. 214 *ad init.*

tine. The proofs of its spuriousness that I am able to put my finger on seem to me at least overwhelming.

To begin with, the homily in question is tainted in its source. It was found from the first in bad company, so to say. It is one of four which, in codices dating from 800 A. D., are styled *De Symbolo Libri Quatuor*, and attributed to Augustine.[5] Three of these are to-day rejected as spurious on all hands. The fourth is, from the nature of the case, suspect. Possidius knew only of three such discourses on the Symbol by St. Augustine, which he cites as "De Symbolo, tractatus tres."[6] Two of these are readily identified as the sermons numbered respectively 212 and 214, already cited. The third, whether it exists among the writings of St. Augustine that have come down to us or not, is not any of the four *ad Catechumenos*. It remains to show this of the only one of them which is generally admitted as genuine, that one, namely, which comes first in order in Migne's collection.[7]

In a footnote to a former article, it was pointed out that the author of this homily cites "in vitam aeternam" as part of the Creed, which St. Augustine never does in any of the writings that are certainly his. Nor did these words form part of the Creed known to the contemporaries of Augustine in the West, Rufinus, St. Jerome, and St. Ambrose, if the last named be indeed the author of the *Explanatio Symboli ad Initiandos*. The author of the homily seems to have borrowed the idea, if not the very words, from Sermon 40 of St. John Chrysostom,[8] where we read: "And as the word 'resurrection' is not enough to convey the whole truth (for many who rose again died again, as those who rose again under the old dispensation, as Lazarus, as those who arose when Christ died), we are instructed to say, *And in the life everlasting*."

At page 213 of his work, Burn says: "The addition *vitam aeternam* had been in use in the African Church since the third century." He means that it had been in use as part of the Symbol, and in this he is astray. The African Church got its Symbol from

[5] Migne, *loc. cit.*

[6] *Cf.* Migne's Index to the works of St. Augustine, col. 20.

[7] Pearson, however, in his volume of critical notes on the Creed, gives the reference simply as "auctor homiliae de Symbolo ad Catechumenos."

[8] Migne, P. G., tom. 61.

the Roman, and kept it unchanged till after St. Augustine's time. How can it be maintained that St. Augustine, expounding the Symbol to Africans in the African Church, deliberately left out so notable a part as this would be of the Faith in which they had been baptized? Immediately after his comment on "the resurrection of the flesh," in *De Fide et Symbolo*, he says: "This is the Faith which is summed up in a few words in the Symbol, and given to neophytes to be kept by them." The theory that Augustine knew of two Symbols, one learned from Ambrose at Milan when he was baptized, another which he found in possession in the African Church, breaks down completely in face of the fact that it is the Symbol of Milan and of Rome that he gives to his African neophytes. The only prop the critics have for this theory (doubtful or spurious sermons are worse than valueless, being themselves without a prop or in need of one) is too frail to support it. They find the *vitam aeternam* in the baptismal interrogatory, as cited by Cyprian. But Cyprian got his Symbol from Tertullian, and *vitam aeternam* is no part of Tertullian's Symbol, which is the Old Roman pure and simple. The presence of *vitam aeternam* in Cyprian's formula does but show that what is obviously implied in "carnis resurrectionem" of the Symbol was from a very early time expressed in the interrogatory.

But there is yet more cogent proof than this that the homily *de Symb. ad. Catech.* is spurious. In the Old Roman Creed, the fourth article runs: "Crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried." So we find it cited, not only by St. Augustine, but in the works of contemporary and even later writers of the same century, such as St. Maximus of Turin,[9] and St. Peter Chrysologus.[10] Nay, a full hundred years after the time of St. Augustine, and in the Church of Africa, St. Fulgentius knows of no change in the fourth article, but gives it as it stood in St. Augustine's day.[11] On the other hand, the author of the homily *de Symb. ad. Catech.* cites the fourth article just as we have it to-day—"Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried." The inference is that he either was not of the African Church at all, or, if he was, that

[9] Migne, tom. 57, col. 434.
[10] *Ib.*, tom. 52, col. 359.
[11] Migne, tom. 65, col. 825.

the homily was not composed till more than a hundred years after the death of St. Augustine. It may seem a trifling thing to add that the form of address employed by the author of the homily is never once used in a single one of the three hundred and forty sermons to be found among the genuine writings of St. Augustine, nor in any one of the thirty and three more recently discovered and published as his in an appendix to the volume which contains the index to his works in Migne's collection.[12] With St. Augustine it is "brethren," "dearly beloved brethren," "dearly beloved," "your charity," "your holiness." Once he has, "sons of light, brothers dearly beloved," and once in the course of a sermon *ad infantes*, as the neophytes were called, we find "my brothers, my sons, my daughters, my sisters," but this is not a form of address. The author of the homily, on the other hand, uses "sons" simply.

Nor are there wanting other tokens of the spurious character of this homily. The author borrows freely from St. Augustine, copies his style pretty closely, essays to think his thoughts, but these are sometimes beyond him. It is here especially that he betrays the prentice hand. He lacks Augustine's mastery of his subject, his mental grasp, his logical exactness, his sense of proportion. To give one instance of the man's deficiency in this last particular, there is in this homily on the Symbol more than a column and a half of a digression on the patience of Job. Speaking of God's omnipotence, he says: "Facit quidquid bene vult, quidquid juste vult; quidquid autem male fit, non vult." Now, this is not exact. It should be: Facit quidquid vult, et quidquid vult, bene vult, juste vult. The second part of the statement, too, needs to be supplemented by some such words as, "eo tamen bene uti novit." "For [St. Augustine himself it is who says it] as the wicked make an evil use of a nature which is good, that is, God's good work, God, being good, makes a good use even of their evil doings, so that His Almighty Will is not frustrated in aught."[13] Again, the author of the homily says: "Deus non dimittit peccata nisi baptizatis." This is worse than inexact; it is untrue, and in open contradiction to the teaching of St. Augustine, where he says that not only martyrdom may supply the place of

[12] Of course, one naturally looks for it in the opening paragraph.

[13] Serm. 214.

baptism, but also "faith and sincere repentance, if haply time be wanting to administer the sacrament."[14] Even had he said "Ecclesia" instead of "Deus," his statement would have been true only of what the Church does in the tribunal of penance. An unbaptized person in good faith, who should have only attrition for his sins, would obtain the forgiveness of them by receiving Holy Communion from the hands of the Church.

It is, however, in his treatment of the Divine Omnipotence and its relation to things impossible, that the deficiency of the author of this homily is most marked. In what purports to be an instruction to persons who were novices in the deep things of the Faith, he sets out, the very first thing, with a startling paradox. "God is almighty," he says, "and because He is almighty, He cannot die, He cannot be deceived, He cannot lie." This is bad enough, bewildering as it must have been to the catechumen. The reason assigned for the puzzling statement is worse: it is trivial, not to say childish. "For," he proceeds to enlighten his hearers, "if He could die, He would not be almighty; if He could lie, or deceive, or be deceived, or deal unjustly, He would not be almighty; because if He could do any of these things, He would not be worthy of being almighty." As if the attribute of omnipotence were a gift bestowed upon deserving Deity! Contrast with this imbecility the masterful way in which St. Augustine grapples with the difficult point in Sermon 214 on the Symbol. He does not begin with a paradox, but feels his way cautiously along, as it were. He points out first that belief in the omnipotence of God implies belief also in there being absolutely nothing in nature which He did not create. After developing this point fully, he goes on, in the next paragraph, to show that, while the wicked do many things against God's will, this does not derogate from His omnipotence, nor defeat His purpose in the long run. If He were not able to make the wicked subserve His good and just ends, He would not have suffered them to be born or to live; "whom He did not make wicked, since He made them men; for, not the sins, which are against nature, but the natures themselves He made. Prescient of the future, He could not, indeed, but know that men were going to be wicked. As He knew, however, the

[14] *De Bapt. contra Donat*, c. 22.

evil they were going to do, so He knew the good that He was going to bring out of this evil." He instances the good that God wrought for mankind out of the malice of Satan, of the Jews, and of the traitor Judas. Next comes a paragraph in elucidation of the paradox referred to above, which is well worth giving word for word:

"But, as I have said that the only thing the Almighty cannot do is what He does not will to do, if any one should be tempted to think me rash in saying that there is anything the Almighty cannot do, let him call to mind that the blessed Apostle says so also. *If we believe not, He who continueth faithful cannot deny Himself* (2 Tim. 2: 13). But it is because He will not that He can not; because He even cannot will. For justice cannot will to do what is unjust, nor wisdom will to do what is foolish, nor truth will what is false. From this we gather that there are many other things, besides this that the Apostle speaks of, *He cannot deny Himself*, which the Almighty God cannot do. I say it openly, and I am emboldened by His truth to say that which I dare not gainsay: God Almighty cannot die, cannot change, cannot be deceived, cannot but be blessed, cannot be overcome. Perish the thought that these and the like things could be predicated of Omnipotence! And thus does the force of truth constrain us to believe, not only that God is Almighty, because these things are not true of Him, but that He would not at all be almighty, if they were. For, whatever God is He is as willing to be. He is eternal, therefore, as willing it; unchangeable, veracious, blessed, and unconquerable, as having a will to be so. If, then, He could be what He does not will to be, He would not be almighty; but He is almighty; therefore, what He wills to be He can be. And therefore what He wills not, cannot be, being called, as He is, the Almighty, because He can do all that He wills. Of Him the Psalmist says: *All things whatsoever He willed He hath done in heaven and on earth* (Ps. 104: 6)."

This is somewhat subtle reasoning. We shall be able to follow it more easily if we do but keep clearly in view what the Saint is aiming to show. He assumes as being of faith that God is omnipotent, eternal, veracious, and the rest. He shows, in the first place, that what God cannot do is such that He does not and can

not will to do it; for God is justice, and justice cannot will to do what is unjust; God is truth, and truth cannot do what is false. He sets Himself to show, in the second place, that so far is God's not being able to do what He does not will to do from being derogatory to His omnipotence, that if it were possible for anything to be without His willing it, He would not be omnipotent at all. He points out that God's will is really one with His other attributes, and with His essence. As His will, then, is one with His eternity, with His unchangeableness, with His truth, He must needs will to be eternal, to be unchangeable, to be veracious. Now, the very idea of omnipotence includes the power to be and do whatever one wills. But, as God must needs will to be eternal, He cannot will to die; and as He must needs will to be veracious, He cannot will to deceive or to lie. If He could die, then, or deceive, He would not have the power of being and doing whatever He willed, and would not, therefore be omnipotent. But He is omnipotent; therefore, whatsoever He willeth that He is and that He doeth in heaven and on earth.

All this may look like a digression from the main topic; but really it is not. The objection founded on the passage in the homily now shown to be spurious, lay right across the path of the tradition which traces back to the Apostles the origin of the Symbol. The only effective means of getting it out of the way was to blast the homily. And it is something to have cleared the way. It is something to have got from a great authority, who is represented as unfriendly, free leave to follow our quest up to the very gates of Jerusalem and into the full light of the Apostolic Day.

It may still be said that, at any rate, St. Augustine does not help us in our quest. His silence, too, is taken to indicate that he knows nothing of the tradition respecting the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol. It is never too safe to argue from the silence of an author. Two of the contemporaries of Augustine, themselves voluminous writers, just happen to mention the tradition once. But their passing allusion to it ranks them among our most important witnesses to the tradition. Is it likely that the disciple of St. Ambrose and the friend of St. Jerome could have been in ignorance of a tradition so notable, the existence of which

is vouched for in his day by both of them? About a century after St. Augustine's time, and in the African Church, we find St. Fulgentius testifying that "the Symbol of the Christian Faith was . . . drawn up by the Apostles in accordance with the rule of the Truth."[15] This famous Bishop of Carthage lived so near the times of St Augustine, and made so close a study of his works, that he may well be styled his disciple. Again we ask, Is it likely the master was ignorant of the tradition?

There is another reason why it is unsafe to argue from silence, especially in the case of so voluminous a writer as St. Augustine. It is that one can hardly ever be quite sure of the truth of one's premise. Who can say that he has read all the works of St. Augustine through, and noted what he says or has left unsaid? Besides, there are two ways in which a writer may witness to a fact; explicitly, and by implication. Now, St. Augustine certainly does witness at least in the latter of these two ways to the traditional teaching of the Church about the origin of the Symbol. In his controversy with the Donatists, defending the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, he says: "This custom I believe as coming down by tradition from the Apostles. So, there are many things not found in their writings, nor in the canons of Councils of a later date, which, because they are observed by the universal Church, are believed to have derived their origin and received their sanction from no other than the Apostles."[16] Again: "A custom which the men even of that day, looking farther back, did not find to have been established by those who went before them, is rightly believed to have originated with the Apostles."[17] And once more, in the form of a general proposition: "That which the whole Church holds, and which has not been instituted by Councils, but has been always held fast, we have every reason to regard as the tradition of the Apostles."[18] But the whole Church held the Baptismal Creed known as the Apostolic Symbol in St. Augustine's day; it was not instituted by Councils, but had been always held fast; therefore, according to

[15] *In Defens. Symb. adv. Arianos.* Migne, tom. 65, col. 822.
[16] *De Bapt. contra Donat.*, tom, 9, lib. 2, c. 7, n. 12.
[17] *Ib.*, lib. 4, c. 6, n. 9.
[18] *Ib.*, c. 24.

St. Augustine, we have the very best reason to regard it as having been handed down by tradition from the Apostles.

St. Augustine's belief in the Apostolic origin of the Symbol is, therefore, logically and necessarily implied in the principle he lays down with regard to Apostolic tradition. But we have in the following passage, or I am greatly mistaken, if not an explicit statement of his belief, at least the very next thing to it. He is combating the view that baptism may be given offhand to anyone who makes a profession of faith in the Divine Sonship of Christ, such as the eunuch baptized by Philip made (Acts 8 : 35–38). I translate with almost literal exactness from the text in Migne :

"That eunuch, they tell us, whom Philip baptized, said no more than, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God ;' and, on making this profession, forthwith received baptism. Are we, then, willing that men, on giving this response only, should incontinently be baptized? that not one word should be said by the catechist, nothing professed by the believer, about the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead, in fine, about the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, except that He is the Son of God ;—not a word about His incarnation in the Virgin's womb, the passion, the death on the cross, the burial, the resurrection on the third day, the ascension, and the session on the right hand of the Father? For, if the eunuch, when he had made answer, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,' thought this was all that was needed, and that he could at once be baptized, and go his way, why do we not take pattern by his case, and dispense with the other things that we deem necessary to bring out by questioning and get an answer to from the candidate for baptism, even when time presses and it is not possible for him to learn them by heart? But if the Scripture is silent, and leaves these other things which Philip did when baptizing the eunuch to be taken for granted, and in saying, *Philip baptized him* (Acts 8 : 35–38), gives us to understand that everything was done which had to be done, as we know from the tradition that has come down from one generation to another, although Scripture, for the sake of brevity, does not mention it ; in like manner, when we find it written that Philip *preached* unto him the Lord Jesus, we cannot at all doubt that in the catechism those things were dealt with which bear upon the life and conduct of him who believes in the Lord Jesus. For, to preach Christ is not only to teach what must be believed concerning Christ, but also what he has

to observe who becomes a member of Christ's body; nay, in sooth, to teach all that is to be believed of Christ, not merely whose Son He is; to set forth whence He is as to His Divinity, of whom born according to the flesh, what things He suffered and why, what the virtue of His resurrection is, what gift the Spirit has promised and given to the faithful. . . ."[19]

This is a very important testimony. Historical criticism assumes that the primitive Baptismal Creed of the Church was the simple profession of faith in Christ recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts.[20] St. Augustine, so far from holding this view, maintains that even in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, which might well seem an exceptional case, Philip carried out the baptismal service in substantially the same way as it used to be carried out in the fourth and fifth centuries, and as it continues to be carried out down to this day. The Scripture, he grants, does not say so in terms, but leaves it to be inferred; and "we know" that it was done. How did they know? By Apostolic tradition —"serie traditionis," an unbroken chain of oral communication whose first links were forged in the workshop of the Apostles. And what was the very first thing to be done, according to the Apostolic tradition? St. Augustine does not leave us to conjecture. He is clear that the very first thing to be done was to instruct in the Faith the person to be baptized, to deliver the Creed to the catechumen. But what Creed, according to St. Augustine, was delivered to the catechumen, the "eunuch of great authority under Queen Candace," whom Philip instructed in the Faith? Was it a formula that contained only the second article of the Symbol known to Augustine? Nothing of the kind. It was the whole Creed, the whole Symbol—"imo vero cuncta dicere quae sunt credenda de Christo." Tradition said nothing of what passed between Philip and the eunuch. But the Apostolic origin of the Symbol was known "serie traditionis," and from this the inference was an easy one that the eunuch was taught all the truths contained in the Symbol. We claim, therefore, the great Bishop of Hippo as another witness to the tradition of the Apostolic authorship of the Creed.

[19] *De Fide et Operibus*, c. 9, cols. 205–6.

[20] *Dogma, Gerarchia e Culto*, p. 326. Burn, *An Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 32 and p. 43.

The Master had charged His Apostles, when He sent them out into all the world, to give baptism only to believers: *He who believes and is baptized shall be saved.* Believes what? The Gospel, of course. The whole Gospel? Yes. *In extenso,* as we have it in the New Testament writings and in Tradition? The thing was not to be thought of for one moment. How, then, the whole Gospel? In a compendious form, in a nutshell—in the Symbol, in short, universally known in the East during the second, third, and fourth centuries as "the Faith," because it was the sum of what candidates for baptism were required to believe and make profession of. Can we conceive the Apostles to have been so neglectful of their plain duty as not to have drawn up this Formula of Faith when the Master had charged them to exact a profession of the Faith from every soul who should seek at their hands the boon of regeneration in the waters of baptism? The question of what was to be believed by the candidate for baptism, and in what "form of sound words" this Faith should find expression, pressed for solution from the very first. Therefore the Apostles took no steps to solve and settle it once for all. The school of historical criticism, denying the Apostolic origin of the Symbol, must bear the burden of this incredible consequence.

We have yet to glance at the parallel line of tradition in the East before seeking in the New Testament writings for tokens and traces of the existence of the Symbol. What we know of the secrecy observed regarding it will serve to make us content with this. It forbids us, at the same time, to look for more.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

Analecta.

EX ACTIS LEONIS ET E SECRETARIA BREVIUM.

I.

Leo XIII probat novam editionem parvi catechismi Venerabilis Cardinalis Bellarmini.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles Fratres Nostri Episcopi Suburbicarii, ceterique Romanae regionis Antistites, cum in coetum convenissent, in eam unanimes ivere sententiam, ut Catechismus, quem minorem aiunt, a Venerabili Cardinali Roberto Bellarmino compositus, iterum edatur typis, ac nonnullis pro temporum necessitate, adiectis, in ipsorum dioecesibus ad christifideles erudiendos adhibeatur.—Quoniam de eo libro agitur, quem saeculorum usus et plurimorum Episcoporum Doctorumque Ecclesiae iudicium comprobavit; susceptum consilium, sanctum ac saluberrimum, placere Nobis etiam edicimus. Quare, praedictorum Venerabilium Fratrum studia in commissum cuique gregem amplissime laudantes, propositum eorumdem, Apostolica benedictione adhibita, confirmamus.

Ex Aedibus Vaticanis, die III Decembris MDCCCCI, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo quarto.

LEO PP. XIII.

II.

LEO XIII GRATOS ANIMI SENSUS TESTATUR EPIS CANADENSIBUS OB ERECTAM AEDEM IN URBE OCTAVIENSI, PRO DELEGATO APLICO.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles fratres, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem:

Allatum est Nobis sacrorum Antistites Canadensis Regionis, collatis liberaliter pecuniis, stabiles aedes in urbe Octaviensi Delegato Nostro copioso sumptu comparasse, ubi ille, tamquam in proprio domicilio, pro sua dignitate, resideret.—Haud equidem Nos latebat quo studio atque observantia egregii isti Praesules Apostolicam hanc Sedem prosequerentur: verum ceteris, quas hac de re accepimus, pluribus praeclarisque significationibus novum nunc, illudque Nobis iucundissimum, testimonium accedit. Hanc autem animorum cum Apostolica Cathedra coniunctionem eo libentius commendamus, quod ut ea Nobis in tam trepidis undequaque rebus solatio est, ita ab ea maxime rei catholicae pendent vigor atque incrementa. Quapropter gratos animi Nostri sensus illis omnibus testatos volumus, qui ad stabiles aedes Delegato Nostro in Canadensi regione, honoris causa, constituendas operam contulerunt; cuius in eum obsequii participes etiam accepimus meritissimos Patres Sulpicianos Provinciae Canadensis. Benevolentiae autem Nostrae pignus et caelestium munerum auspicem, universis oblatoribus Apostolicam benedictionem ex animo impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die x Maii MDCCCCI, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo quarto.

LEO PP. XIII.

III.

LEO XIII HORTATUR BOHEMOS UT, NON OBSTANTE SERMONIS PATRII DIVERSITATE, CORDE ET ANIMO UNUM SINT.

Venerabilibus fratribus Theodoro Archiepiscopo Olomucensi ceterisque Archiepiscopis Bohemiae et Moraviae.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles fratres, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem:

Reputantibus saepe animo, quae sit conditio eeclesiarum vest-

rarum, occurunt Nobis, quod nunc fere ubique, plena omnia metus, plena curarum. Illud tamen gravius apud vos incidit, quod, cum res catholica hostium externorum invidiae atque astui pateat, domesticas etiam causas habet, quibus in discrimen trahatur. Dum enim haereticorum hominum opera palam obscureque id agitur, ut error pervadat fidelium animos; crebrescunt quotidie inter ipsos catholicos semina discordiarum: quae nihil sane aptius ad incidendas vires constantiamque frangendam. Potior autem dissensionis ratio, in Bohemis praesertim, repetenda est ex sermone, quo incolae, pro sua quisque origine, utuntur. Insitum enim natura est acceptam a proavis linguam amare tuerique velle, Nobis quidem a dirimendis de re hac controversiis abstinere decretum est. Profecto sermonis patrii tuitio si certos intra fines consistit, reprehensionem non habet: quod tamen de ceteris privatorum iuribus valet, valere hic etiam tenendum est; ne quid ex eorum prosecutione communis rei publicae utilitas patiatur. Est igitur eorum, qui publicam rem administrant, sic, aequitate incolumi, velle integra singulorum iura, ut commune tamen civitatis bonum stet atque vigeat. Quod ad Nos attinet, monet officium cavere sedulo, ne ex eiusmodi controversiis periclitetur religio, quae princeps est animorum bonum ceterorumque bonorum origo.

Itaque, Venerabiles Fratres, vehementer cupimus atque hortamur, ut fideles, cuique vestrum crediti, etsi ortu varii ac sermone sunt, eam tamen necessitudinem animorum retineant longe nobilissimam, quae ex cummunione fidei eorumdemque sacrorum gignitur. Quotquot enim in Christo baptizati sint, unum habent Dominum unamque fidem; atque adeo unum sunt corpus unusque spiritus, sicut vocati sunt in una ope vocationis. Dedecet vero, qui tot sanctissimis vinculis coniunguntur eamdemque in caelis civitatem inquirunt, eos terrenis rationibus distrahi, invicem, ut inquit Apostolus, provocantes, invicem invidentes. Haec ergo, quae ex Christo est, animorum cognatio, assidue fidelibus est inculcanda omnique studio extollenda. Maior est siquidem fraternitas Christi quam sanguinis: sanguinis enim fraternitas similitudinem tantum corporis refert, Christi autem fraternitas unanimitatem cordis animaeque demonstrat, sicut scriptum est: Multitudinis credentium erat cor unum et anima una (S. Maxim. inter S. Aug. C.).

Qua in re, homines sacri cleri exemplo ceteros anteire oportet. Praeterquam enim quod ab eorum officio dissidet eiusmodi se dissensionibus immiscere; si in locis versantur, quae ab hominibus incoluntur, varii generis variaeque linguae, facile, ni ab omni contentionis specie abstinent, in odium offensionemque alterutrius partis incurrent; quo nihil sacri muneris exercitationi infestius. Debent sane fideles re usuque cognoscere Ecclesiae ministros non nisi aeternas aestimare animorum rationes nec prorsus quae sua sunt studere, sed unice quae Jesu Christi. Quod si omnibus universe haec nota est, qua Christi discipuli dignoscantur, ut dilectionem habeant ad invicem; id de hominibus sacri cleri mutuo inter se multo magis tenendum est. Neque ideo solum, quod Christi charitatem hausisse largius merito censendi sunt; verum etiam, quod quisque eorum, fideles alloquens, debet Apostoli verbis posse uti: Imitatores mei estote, sicut ego Christi (Philip. iii. 17.) Facile quidem damus id esse factu perarduum, nisi elementa discordiarum mature ex animis eradantur; tunc videlicet cum ii, qui in cleri spem adolescunt, in sacris seminariis formantur. Quamobrem, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc studiose curetis, ut seminariorum alumni tempestive discant in fraternitatis amore simplici ex corde invicem diligere, utpote renati non ex semine corruptibili, sed incorruptibili per verbum Dei vivi (Petr. i. 22. s.). Erumpentes autem animorum perturbationes cohibete fortiter, nec pacto ullo vigere patiamini; ita, ut qui clero destinantur, si labii unius, ob originis discrimen, esse nequeunt, at certe cor unum sint atque anima una. Ex hac porro voluntatum concordia, quae in cleri ordine eluceat, illud ut iam innuimus, praeter cetera, commodum sequetur, quod sacrorum ministri efficacius monebunt fideles ne in tuendis vindicandisque iuribus, suae cuiusque gentis propriis praetereant modum nimiove studio abrepti iustitiam et communes reipublicae utilitates posthabeant.

Hoc namque, ob regionum vestrarum adiuncta, praecipuum modo esse officium sacerdotum putamus opportune importune fideles hortari, ut alterutrum diligant; monereque assidue, christiano nomine dignum non esse, qui animo et re mandatum novum a Christo datum non impleat, ut diligamus invicem sicut ipse dilexit nos. Non autem is implet, qui caritatem ad eos tantum pertinere putet, qui lingua vel genere coniuncti sunt. Si enim, inquit Christus, diligitis eos, qui vos diligunt, nonne et publicani

hoc faciunt? (Math. v. 46, s.) Nimirum charitatis christianae hoc proprium est, ut ad omnes aeque se porrigat, non enim, ut monet Apostolus, est distinctio iudaei ac graeci: nam idem Dominus omnium, dives in omnes, qui invocant illum (Rom. x. 12.). Deus autem qui charitas est, impertiat benigne, ut idem omnes sapiant, unanimes, idipsum sentientes, nihil per contentionem; sed in humilitate superiores sibi invicem arbitrantes; non quae sua sunt singuli considerantes, sed ea quae aliorum (Philip. ii. 2).

Horum vero sit auspex Nostraeque simul benevolentiae testis apostolica benedictio, quam vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, fidelibus cuique Vestrum commissis amantissime in Domino elargimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xx. Augusti anno MCMI. Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo quarto.

LEO PP. XIII.

E S. CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

I.

DECRETUM.

APPROBATUR INSTITUTUM SORORUM AB ANGELO CUSTODE, DE CIVITATE MONTIS ALBANI.

SS.mus D.nus Noster Leo Divina Providentia PP. XIII attenta ubertate fructuum salutarium, quam iugiter tulit Institutum Sororum ab Angelo Custode[1] nuncupatum, attentisque praesertim litteris commendatitiis Antistitum locorum in quibus eiusdem Instituti domus reperiuntur, in Audentia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium Praefecto die 18 Augusti 1902, Institutum ipsum, cuius finem seu scopum iam summopere laudaverat et commendaverat, uti Congregationem votorum simplicium, sub regimine moderatricis generalis, approbare et confirmare dignatus est, prout praesentis decreti tenore approbat et confirmat, salva Ordinariorum iurisdictione ad formam SS. Canonum et Apostolicarum Constitutionum: dilata ad opportunius tempus approbatione Constitutionum.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria praelaudatae Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium, hac die 27 Augusti 1902.

A. *Card.* DI PIETRO, *Praef.*
BUDINI, *Subsecret.*

[1] Illius Instituti domus princeps existit in civitate Montis Albani, in Galliis.

II.

DECRETUM.

INSTITUTUM FRATRUM TERTII ORD. S. Fr. A B. MARIA VIRGINE PERDOLENTE, ILLIUSQUE CONSTITUTIONES APPROBANTUR.

Anno Domini 1889 auctore rev. P. Aloisio a Masamagrell Ordinis Fr. Minorum Capulatorum, in Archidioecesi Valentina in Hispania, Archiepiscopo probante, ortum duxit Institutum Fratrum Tertii Ordinis S. Francisci Capulatorum a Beata Maria Virgine Perdolente. Peculiaris finis sive scopus enunciatis Fratribus propositus in eo est, ut ipsi primum quidem propriae consulant sanctificationi per vota obedientiae, paupertatis et castitatis, certamque vivendi normam suis in Constitutionibus praescriptam, tum vero urgentem Christi Domini caritatem enixe explicent praesertim erga perditos adolescentulos; ita nempe ut eos e vitiorum coeno erutos opportunioribus modis erudire ac pie educare satagant. Cuncti autem eodem victu cultuque utuntur, sub regimine Moderatoris Generalis sexto quoque anno eligendi, et exacto novitiatu, recensita tria vota, prius ad tempus dein in perpetuum, ritu simplici nuncupant. Porro, aucto celeriter sodalium numero, praeter domum principem in praefata Archidioecesi Valentina existentem, aliae etiam domus in dioecesibus Placentina et Matritensi-Complutensi, nec non in Archidioecesi Hispalensi canonice erectae fuerunt. Quibus in locis memorati Fratres, superna favente gratia, adeo bonum Christi odorem effuderunt eamque tulere iugiter salutarium fructuum ubertatem, ut non modo Sacrorum Praesulum, sed etiam saecularium Principum benevolentiam, favorem et admirationem sibi affatim conciliaverint.

Quum autem nuper Instituti Moderatores humillime supplicaverint SS.mo D.no N.ro Leoni Divina Providentia PP. XIII ut Institutum ipsum eiusque Constitutiones Apostolica Auctoritate approbare dignaretur, Antistites locorum, de quibus supra, datis ultro litteris, eorum preces summopere commendare non dubitarunt. Itaque Sanctitas Sua re mature perpensa attentisque praesertim commendatitiis litteris praefatorum Antistitum, in Audientia habita ab infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium Praefecto die 18 huius mensis, memoratum Institutum cum suis Constitutionibus, uti Congregationem

votorum simplicium sub regimine moderatoris generalis approbare et confirmare dignata est, prout praesentis Decreti tenore benigne approbat et confirmat, salva Ordinariorium iurisdictione ad formam Sacrorum Canonum et Apostolicarum Constitutionum.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria praelaudatae Sacrae Congregationis Episcoporum et Regularium, die 19 Septembris 1902.

A. *Card.* Di Pietro, *Praef.*
O. Giorgi, *Aud.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

In universa ditione Hispana, omitti poterit incisum "et captivos christianos, etc." in Collecta "Et Famulos tuos. . . ."

Per Decretum Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis *Provinciae Ecclesiasticae S. Iacobi de Chile* 19 Iunii 1873 fe. re. Pius Papa IX concesit ditioni Chilensi ut in Collecta "Et Famulos tuos" omittatur incisum "et captivos christianos qui in Saracenorum potestate detinentur, tua misericordia liberare." Nunc eisdem de causis E.mus et R.mus D.nus Cardinalis Iosephus Martin de Herrera Archiepiscopus Compostellanus cum aliis Archiepiscopis et Episcopis Hispanis Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum Leonem Papam XIII supplicibus votis deprecatus est, ut praefatum Indultum ad totam ditionem Hispanam extendatur. Sanctitas porro sua, referente infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Praefecto, attentis peculiaribus adiunctis, petitam extensionem memorati Indulti pro universa ditione Hispana concedere dignata est. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Die 19 Augusti 1902.

D. *Card.* Ferrata, *Praef.*
D. Panici *Archiep. Laodicen.*, *Secret.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE DE PROPAGANDA FIDE.

Indultum concedens Translationem Festi Titularis.

Beatissime Pater :

Jacobus Cardinalis Gibbons Archiepiscopus Baltimorensis aliique Statuum Foederatorum Americae Borealis Archiepiscopi in annuali conventu una simul congregati, a Sanctitate Tua humili-

ter petunt, ut ratione habita circumstantiarum eorum locorum, benigne concedere dignetur Indultum vi cujus in quibuscumque Statuum praedictorum ecclesiis, sive in urbibus sive extra, Titulare festum quando inciderit in diem ferialem transferri valeat quoad extrinsecam solemnitatem ad Dominicam proxime insequentem, quemadmodum ibidem concessum fuit pro ecclesiis ruralibus et oppidulorum.

Ex Audientia SSmi habita die 3 Februarii 1903, SSmus D. N. Leo Div. Prov. PP. XIII, referente infrascripto S. Congnis de Propag. Fide Secrio, attentis specialibus locorum circumstantiis, benigne indulsit ut in singulis supramemoratis ecclesiis, quibus annis titulare festum in diem ferialem inciderit, firma manente obligatione celebrandi Missam et persolvendi officium de eodem festo die in Kalendario affixa, extrinseca ejus solemnitas cum Missa solemni et Vesperis transferri possit ad Dominicam proxime insequentem, dummodo non occurrat festum ritus duplicis primae classis, vel Dominica juxta rubricas privilegiata. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Aed. S. Congnis de Propaganda Fide die et anno ut supra.

(*No. 53508*). ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secrius.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—Pontifical Acts (Secretariate of Briefs):

1. The Holy Father approves the proposed revision of Cardinal Bellarmin's small Catechism, with a view of making it conformable to modern needs, as a uniform standard of Christian instruction throughout the various dioceses of Italy.

2. Praises the zeal of Canadian Catholics in providing a suitable residence for the Apostolic Delegate of the Dominion.

3. Addresses the Hierarchy of Bohemia and Moravia, advising them to counteract the national animosities among the faithful speaking different languages, by maintaining unity of sentiment and action in all matters appertaining to the interest of the souls intrusted to their care.

II.—The S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars:

1. Approves the founding of a religious institute, under the name of the *Sisters of the Guardian Angel*, in the Diocese of Montauban (France).

2. Approves the Constitutions and Rules of a Spanish community of Tertiaries under the name of *Brothers of St. Francis of the Dolorous Virgin.*

III.—The S. Congregation of Rites sanctions the omission in the liturgical office (proper for Spain) of a phrase referring to the liberation of captives among the Saracens, for which there is no longer occasion.

IV.—The S. Congregation of Propaganda complies with a request of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons to extend a general Indult to the churches in the United States, by which solemnity of Titular and Patronal feasts (occurring on weekdays when the faithful cannot attend) may be transferred to the following Sunday.

TITULAR FEASTS OF CHURCHES IN THE UNITED STATES MAY BE TRANSFERRED.

(THE NEW DECREE.)

In the August number (1902) of The Ecclesiastical Review we stated that there was no sanction for the practice (apparently authorized by a *Monitum* of the "Ordo" in use in the greater number of dioceses in the States) of celebrating the Titular or Patronal Feasts of churches on the Sunday following their calendar date, whenever the solemnity cannot take place on the day of the feast proper.

In order to make sure of the matter we requested the Rt. Rev. Dr. Gabriels, Bishop of Ogdensburg (whose interpretation in his excellent manual, *Rubricae Mechlinienses*, had given rise to the question), to present it in form of a *Dubium* before the Holy See. The answer came promptly in a Rescript of the S. Congregation of Propaganda, after having been referred to the S. Congregation of Rites, which declared that the transferring of Titular Feasts is not authorized without a special Apostolic Indult.

The Ordo accordingly altered its *Monitum* for the present year, adding the words "*si constet de expresso atque speciali indulto.*"

Thereupon we addressed a letter to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, suggesting that some steps be taken to remove the uncertainty of the existence of a former Indult (of which there appears no record). This could be done by an application to the Holy See in the name of the entire Hierarchy, whereby a new concession would be granted to all the churches throughout the United States whenever the circumstances advised the use of the privilege.

His Eminence accordingly placed the matter before the Arch-

bishops at their recent annual convention, and with their consent obtained from the Holy See the Decree which removes the former doubt, and of which the authentic text is published in the present number of our *Analecta*. (Cf. page 457.) The manner of celebrating the Titular Feast, when transferred from its calendar day, has been amply explained in former volumes of the REVIEW. (Volume XXVII, pp. 194, 421, 547, and previous volumes.)

THE BAPTISM OF THE CAMPBELLITES AND PROPER INTENTION.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Qu. The article which appeared in the January number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, on the question, "Is the Baptism of the Campbellites Valid?" seems to me to be based on a misconception of the tenet of the Campbellites concerning Baptism. In these parts of the States we are surrounded by quite a considerable number of Campbellites, and conversions among them are not an infrequent occurrence. In the past it has been the practice of the priests here, as far as I can ascertain, to administer in all such cases conditional, and not *absolute*, baptism, as would be required were your opinion correct. After careful investigation I find no reason to recognize the baptism of Campbellites as less valid than that of the Baptists, or even as less doubtful than that administered by the Reformed Episcopalians and many of the Low and Broad Church divisions of that denomination, who simply look upon Baptism as a new religious rite, symbolizing the introduction of the recipient into membership of the Church and, hence, are less careful or exact in the administration of the same. You claim as an essential requisite that the person baptizing intend "*to do* what the Church prescribes or intends." Is this claim, in a certain sense, not somewhat *ultra?* No Protestant baptizing can consistently be expected to intend to do *what the Church intends*, for the ordinary Protestant looks upon *the Church* as the embodiment of evil, etc., and were that intention a *conditio sine qua non*, there would scarcely be any baptism administered by a Protestant, or non-Catholic, that could be considered valid. The intention required as a *conditio sine qua non, is to do what Christ ordained to be done*, and this, I take it, most Protestants who believe in Baptism really intend according to their understanding, and, consequently, baptism thus administered by

them, *positis ponendis*, would be, in the line of matrimony, presumed to be valid.

In order to ascertain the actual belief of the Campbellites concerning Baptism I wrote to Dr. McGarvey, President of the Bible College at Lexington, Ky., the principal theological institution of that sect in this country, and received from him the following answer:

VERY REV. FERDINAND BROSSART.

Dear Sir:—Your letter of the 16th inquiring about the doctrine of baptism taught by the Disciples, has received my careful attention, and without going into all the niceties of the subject as presented by you, I think I can make our position clear to you by a brief statement.

You understand of course that we acknowledge only immersion as baptism, and that we reject the baptism of infants. While we teach that in all ordinary cases the administrator should be a regular minister or officer of the church, the ordinance is not invalidated if administered by any other person. Its validity with us depends, not on the intention of the administrator, but on the intention of the person baptized; and this person must always be a penitent believer. We teach that the remission of sins, direct from God, is bestowed simultaneously with the baptism. We adhere closely to the statements of the Scriptures on the subject, and allow ourselves no unauthorized acts or speculative conclusions on the subject.

Fraternally yours,

J. W. MCGARVEY.

From this answer it is evident that the Campbellites, as well as the Baptists, believe in Baptism as an instrumental cause of the remission of (actual) sin. They seem to deny the efficacy of the Sacrament *ex opere operato*; and it appears that there are but few, if any, Protestants who in theory admit this, though in reality they admit it when they declare that "the remission of sins, direct from God, is bestowed simultaneously with the baptism," as Dr. McGarvey expresses it.

Apart from all this, the peculiar or personal belief of the person baptizing has essentially nothing to do with the validity of baptism. The requisites, of course, are the proper matter, form, and intention *to do what Christ ordained to be done, or instituted*, or, as the great Lehmkuhl puts it: "Ratione objecti, quod intendi debet, et ratione modi, quo ritus ut sacer poni debet, requiritur et *sufficit* ad valorem sacramenti, ut in *confuso*, et, ut dicitur, *reductive* minister in *persona Christi* agere velit, seu ut ritum et aliquo modo qua sacrum exercere intendat, neque contraria aliqua voluntate positive nolit eum *qua a Christo institutum* peragere."[1] Again, ad II, No. 26: "Etsi aliquo modo *minister ut Christi mandatarius* agere atque agere velle debet, tamen (1) non requiritur, ut minister reflexe et expresse intendat

[1] Vol. II, No. 24, II.

agere *nomine Christi*; . . . (2) non requiritur, ut minister expresse intendat agere *nomine Ecclesiae Catholicae*, seu ut *Ecclesia Catholica agere vult*. . . . Hac de re optime Suarez de sacr. disp. 13, sect. 2: 'Dicendum est, requiri intentionem faciendi sacramentum vel sub hoc conceptu, vel sub aliqua ratione confusa et communi seu aequivalenti, sc. *intendendo facere*, quod *Christus instituit*, vel quod Christiani faciunt, vel aliquid simile: *quilibet enim ex his modis intentionis absque controversia sufficit*, et reperiri potest in haeretico vel alio infideli.'" Baptists and Campbellites administer Baptism in the same manner and mostly all believe it to be a necessary condition to attain life everlasting. Their ministers believe that they are ministers of Christ, and desire to act as such according to their conception, and I cannot conceive a valid reason why the Baptism administered by the one should be considered less or more valid than that administered by the other, and in the line of matrimony presumption seems just as much in favor of the validity of the Baptism of the one as it is of the other. Should this position be untenable, a great difficulty would arise in these parts of the States, where the Campbellites abound, concerning many mixed marriages.

It has been claimed by some that there is no moral connection between the matter and form of the baptism administered by the Campbellites, and this may also be said with the same reason of the Baptists, because the minister baptizing pronounces first the form and then submerges the subject under the water; but while this is true, it is evident that in their method of baptizing the subject is in the water, and is touched and washed, in a manner, by the water, and thus a moral connection is sufficiently established to constitute, as far as this requisite is concerned, a real baptism.

I write this at the request of several of the clergy, who have been not a little puzzled since the appearance of your article, and desire some elucidation of the subject, and, if possible, an authoritative decision of the Church, since so much depends upon a proper solution of the difficulty in relation to matrimony.

Covington, Ky. FERDINAND BROSSART.

Resp. The question whether Campbellite baptism is valid baptism in the Christian sense should not present great difficulty, if we can get a clear statement of *what is* the Campbellite practice or usage of Baptism as a religious ceremony.

They *immerse* the neophyte who professes adherence to their community *in water;* they pronounce the words *I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Such at least is their general and admitted practice. In these two things we recognize two essentials—the matter and the form required for true Christian baptism. Do these two elements suffice to make the act valid Christian baptism? No.—Why not? Because they might be performed with an intention which distinctly differentiates the ceremony from that of ordinary Christian baptism; and the intention (though *not a personal belief* in the efficacy of that intention) is requisite to give to matter and form the purpose for which the act and the words were instituted. If I went to a theatre and there saw one actor personating a priest, and another personating a young pagan asking for baptism, would such baptism, though performed in compliance with every detail of matter and form, be Christian baptism? No. And why not? Because, though matter and form are perfect, the act is simply an imitation, in which the performers have no intention of doing what the Church of Christ wishes us to do when she ordains Baptism. Or suppose that a man before pouring water, with the accompanying form, upon an unbaptized child, said to the bystanders: "I do *not* do this with the intention of doing what the *Catholic* Church, which calls itself the Church of Christ, teaches, for I repudiate distinctly the notion that such an act can have any virtue of *regeneration;* but I observe this ancient ceremony because it has a symbolical meaning, like the baptism of penance, performed by John the Baptist and most likely also by Christ, who certainly recommended it to His disciples, for I find it in the Bible."—Would this be Baptism such as Christ intended? No, because the act is performed with the *express intention of doing something different* from what we surely know Christ intended, although the person might insist that Christ meant what he means, and ordered it as a mere symbol of repentance and washing from guilt. If the person thus baptizing had not formulated and declared his *exception* to the Catholic intention, we should, of course, take for granted that he wished to do, as he says, what Christ did command His disciples to do; and his ignorance or erroneous conception of what Christ actually did do would not in this case vitiate his own general

intention. The fact that a man says I am doing what Christ did whilst he expressly disavows what Christ did, gives a meaning to his act which we cannot accept as the act of Christ or the Church. And I do not speak here of the Roman or the Catholic Church, but of the Church as the average Protestant understands the institution of Christ, apart from his personal conviction regarding its separate and specific doctrines. And such is precisely the view of Suarez cited by P. Lehmkuhl to whom Father Brossart refers. He requires *intentionem faciendi sacramentum*, however vague the notion of what the sacrament is may be in the mind of the minister. But in the case of Alexander Campbell the minister says in fact, "I believe in Christ, but *not* the Christ you teach." Now this is what, as I stated in the January number, the Disciples of Christ (Campbellites) actually do, if they carry out the creed of their founder. Alexander Campbell held and taught that Baptism is "the burial in water of the penitent believer who has died to sin," and he explains that this burial must *not* be accepted in the sense of baptismal *regeneration.* In this sense, Quakers would be willing to baptize their members, though they do not believe in Baptism.

I am quite aware of the fact that the average Campbellite, like most of the Protestant sectaries who, feeling the need of some religion, follow the first invitation to embrace a doctrine which suggests honest reform of life, *has no very clear notion as to whether he believes in baptismal regeneration or not.* Some of the "Disciples" probably do believe in it, because they accept the Bible as *interpreted by the individual* to be the sole standard of truth. Indeed a priest, who wrote to us on the subject stating that he himself is a convert, and therefore familiar with the differences of Protestant belief, intimated (and probably Father Brossart also thinks) that we had confounded the doctrine of Baptists with the belief of the Campbellites, and that the latter did profess baptismal regeneration, while the former denied it.—But I did not argue the question on the assumption that the followers of Alexander Campbell might reconstruct his creed by their individual intention, like Mr. McGarvey, who, in his letter, surely expresses no conviction on the subject. Probably the Founder, in his work on *The Remission of Sin*, is not throughout consistent with himself. Hence a writer in the *American Encyclopedia*

could state that baptismal regeneration was one of the fundamental doctrines of the Campbellites; but writers who have looked into the matter without predisposition have found that the contrary is true. "Some loosely defined expressions in his writings," says a minister, in Chambers' *Encyclopedia*, have been interpreted as implying a belief in baptismal regeneration—a doctrine which "the Disciples *repudiate;*"[2] and such is the opinion of other Protestant writers. Those who have read the famous report of the discussion between the founder of the Campbellites and the late Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, can have no doubt as to what the former thought concerning the doctrine of sacramental remission of sin whether through Baptism or Penance.

But, we repeat, what is of importance to remember in this matter, namely, that whilst the *personal belief* as to the efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism *does not form* any part of the essential requisite in the intention of doing what Christ or the Church as His interpreter wants us to do, it must be admitted that the *express intention of doing something that is different* vitiates the sacramental act. Of course the Campbellite may be *bona fide* in his belief that Christ instituted Baptism as a mere symbol; but if he insists on this, which I, as Catholic, know to be error, his act cannot be accepted by me as equivalent to mine either in effect *or in meaning*, though it is outwardly the very likeness of Baptism.

As for the idea of invalidity arising from the separation of form and matter, I have already stated my conviction that the separation of matter and form in the case of Campbellite baptism is not what in ordinary observation constitutes two separate acts. The form and matter will be accepted by an ordinary looker-on as constituting one act. The moral union between form and matter cannot be always gauged by the lapse of time between them; it depends on the character of the act performed. What in the baptism administered by ablution might be considered a sufficient separation of words and action to invalidate the sacramental rite, would not be necessarily so in the case of immersion.

[2] Unfortunately, we have not at hand the work of Alexander Campbell, whence we might quote, and thus are obliged to refer merely to what may be accepted as trustworthy, although generalized statements on the subject.

My opinion then is (and I only offer it as such) that the baptism of Campbellites is invalid, inasmuch as the person baptizing has the intention not of doing what Christ ordained, by excluding that intention, or accepting it only in a fictitious sense according to his own interpretation. If, as Mr. McGarvey states, it is only the intention of the person *baptized* which the minister accepts in each case as his own, it depends, of course, on the individual convert to say whether he or she wanted to receive Christian Baptism without excluding the sense of regeneration. In such cases the Baptism is, of course, valid, if the minister baptizing did not exclude that same intention from his act.

ADDITION OF WATER TO THE WINE AT THE OFFERTORY.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Qu. Father O'Brien, in his *History of the Mass* (p. 275), speaking of the water put into the chalice at the offertory, says: "The water added must never exceed two or three drops." I have a faint recollection that I saw a response somewhere in reply to the question asked of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, whether three or four drops of water were sufficient, and the reply was in the negative. While I know what is said in general on the matter, you will kindly permit me to ask if there is a decision regarding the above point.

Resp. The statement that "the water must never exceed two or three drops" is entirely without warrant. The rubrics (VII, 4) require "parum aquae," that is "a little water." The quantity of water is not, therefore, determined by a fixed number of drops; it is relative and may be more or less; but it may never be so great as to change or destroy the essential quality of the wine to be offered for consecration. Even if the wine is very generous, the amount of water added at the offertory should not equal or rather exceed a third part of the entire contents of the chalice. As for the minimum quantity of the required addition there is a general consent among interpreters of the rubrics that a few (three or four) drops are the proper limit. "*Non* sunt probandi illi sacerdotes qui *unam* guttulam infundunt," says Haberl, since a single drop may easily adhere to the side of the chalice and not mix with the wine, as is intended by the Church.

THE FIGURE OF THE CROSS IN THE "VIA CRUCIS."

Qu. A set of the "Stations of the Cross" were shown me recently, copied, I believe, after an original by Feuerstein. In these pictures our Saviour is represented with the Greek cross T, instead of the customary Latin figure ✝. I should like to know whether from a liturgical point of view there can be any objection to the canonical erection of this set which differs from our traditional form.

A. J. S.

Resp. The figure of the Greek cross in pictorial representations having the purpose of devotion or meditation has nothing objectionable in it. The Church (Latin) uses the Latin form of the cross *as a sacramental;* hence in liturgical acts and blessings that form is prescribed and obligatory. But the images of the Stations are purely suggestive of the fact of the Passion, and have a devotional purpose to help the imagination toward realizing this fact. A Catholic might make his *Via Crucis* in a Greek church, if the stations therein were canonically erected, and he would gain the Indulgences just as he would in a Latin church. Furthermore the precise form of the Holy Cross is not known, and the Greek form has its historical claim on quite as safe ground as the Latin. St. Helena found the Cross; but how the two beams were originally joined has not been handed down to us, probably because the Christians of earlier days were less concerned with the form than with the fact, and they honored the sacred relic indifferent to what a critical posterity might wish to know.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. Dr. Abbott and Professor Jannaris.—Dr. E. A. Abbott in his article on the *Gospels* contributed to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*[1] arrives at the conclusion "that when he (Papias) reached early manhood (105 A.D.), the Johannine Gospel was not yet published; that, in 115–130 A.D., Luke and John were not yet acknowledged as on a level with Mark and Matthew, by the first Christian historian who gives us any account of the Gospels." Referring to these results, Professor Jannaris points out,[2] first, that Dr. Abbott bases his conclusions on a single passage in Eusebius[3] in which this writer is supposed to explain the object of his famous "Ecclesiastical History;" secondly, that Eusebius sets forth the real purpose and plan of his work in its preface, which is quite distinct from the passage indicated by Dr. Abbott; thirdly, that the Doctor has misread the passage on which he bases his argument. As was to be expected, Dr. Abbott had something to say in self-defence[4]: he sets the Professor right on several side issues; he appeals to Lightfoot's and Heinichen's editions of Eusebius in favor of his interpretation of the disputed passage; finally, he charges the Professor with introducing a spurious comma into the Greek text, and altering an accent. The comma and the accent constitute really the fundamental difference between the Professor and the Doctor. The former appeals to the acknowledged sense of Eusebius' preface for their insertion; the latter quotes the authority of Lightfoot and Heinichen for their omission.

According to both, Professor and Doctor, Eusebius[5] promises to indicate: (1) the apostolic successions; (2) the disputed books of Scripture *quoted* by the ecclesiastical writers; (3) the *anecdotes about* the disputed books related by the same authors. In these

[1] Vol. ii, col. 1817 ff., n. 74.
[2] *Contemporary Review*, January, 1903, p. 37 ff.
[3] H. E. III, iii, 3.
[4] *Contemporary Review*, February 1903, p. 249, ff.
[5] H. E. III, iii, 3.

points the disputants agree; their points of disagreement are only two: (1) Professor Jannaris, by the introduction of a comma, makes Eusebius promise that he will intimate who belong to the ecclesiastical writers of each period of the apostolic successions; Dr. Abbott, omitting the comma, knows of no such promise. (2) According to the Professor, who changes the accent of a word in the received text, Eusebius promises that he will relate "*some things* about the canonical and acknowledged writings;" according to the Doctor, who adheres to the received accentuation of the text, Eusebius will indicate "*what* (whatever) has been said concerning the canonical and acknowledged Scriptures." In fact, only the second point of disagreement affects the question at issue, as is evident from the disputants' respective line of argument. Dr. Abbott reasons thus: Eusebius promises to relate "any anecdote of interest" he may find in the early writers respecting the acknowledged books of Scripture. But he relates nothing from the writings of Papias concerning the Fourth Gospel. Therefore Papias cannot have known the Fourth Gospel, or, at least, he cannot have recognized it as a canonical book. In his turn, Professor Jannaris argues: Eusebius promises to relate only *some* of the anecdotes he may find in the early writers respecting the acknowledged books of Scripture. Hence the silence of Eusebius concerning Papias' view of the Fourth Gospel does not necessarily imply the silence of Papias as to the Johannine authorship of the work. It is therefore the accent that forms the real basis of the difference between the Professor and the Doctor.

Dr. Abbott weakens his case by a singular inconsistency. He appeals to the authority of Lightfoot in the question of the accentuation of the passage, but he abandons Lightfoot's authority in the explanation of the text. Lightfoot shows[6] that Eusebius in his use of the writings of Clement of Rome, of Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Theophilus, and Irenæus was quite indifferent to any quotations or references which went toward the establishing of the canonicity of those books which had never been disputed in the Church. Since the four Gospels, the Acts, and thirteen of St. Paul's Epistles, belonged to this class of writings, the silence of

[6] Essays on the Work entitled Supernatural Religion, London, 1889, Macmillan and Co., p. 38 ff.; *cf. Contemporary Review*, January, 1875.

Eusebius as to quotations from them in the writings of Papias does not prove that no such quotations existed. In the same study Lightfoot proves that "as regards the anecdotes containing information relating to the books of the New Testament, he [Eusebius] restricts himself to the narrowest limits which justice to his subject will allow." Neither in this case, therefore, does the silence of Eusebius imply Papias' unacquaintance with the Fourth Gospel.

2. The Abbé Loisy.—Readers interested in Biblical study expect at stated intervals to be entertained by pamphlets or monographs coming from the pen of Abbé Loisy. Not to speak of earlier works of the talented writer, we may here mention his second and enlarged edition of the *Études bibliques*,[7] which appeared about two years ago, and his *Études évangéliques*,[8] and his *L'Évangile et l'Église*,[9] both of which appeared last year. The reader may remember that we spoke of the first of the three publications in these pages for March, 1902 (p. 342); the second and the third we mentioned in the February issue of the present REVIEW. In no case could we give Loisy's views our unqualified approval. In the *Études bibliques* the author is rather unsatisfactory on the questions of the authenticity and historicity of the Fourth Gospel, on its apparent disagreements with the Synoptic Gospels, and on Biblical inerrancy in general: *il ne s'agit plus de savoir si la Bible contient des erreurs, mais bien de savoir ce que la Bible contient de vérité. Que vaut la Bible?*

The *Études évangeliques* are really a continuation of the *Études bibliques*. They contain studies on five different subjects: (1) On the parables in the Synoptic Gospels; (2) on the prologue of the Fourth Gospel; (3–5) on some of the Johannine symbols. According to Loisy, the Synoptic parables are not exactly the seed as sown by Christ, but the seed already germinating. Christ's simple parables have been changed into artificial allegories by the Synoptic writers. As to the prologue of the Fourth Gospel, it is really the key to the whole book. The ideas of light, life, and love are the topics that are symbolically developed

[7] Paris: Picard et Fils. 1901. 8vo. Pp. 160.
[8] Paris: Picard et Fils. 1902. 8vo. Pp. 333.
[9] Paris: Picard et Fils. 1902.

throughout St. John's Gospel. Loisy shows explicitly how this happens in the narratives of Christ's baptism, of the Lord's Supper, and the washing of the feet. The Evangelist introduces Jesus as speaking to the Jews, while in reality it is the writer himself who speaks to his contemporaries. Thus the Fourth Gospel becomes a theological novel rather than a life of Christ. No wonder that even a critic like H. Holtzmann[10] has nothing but praise for Loisy's work. Among Protestant theologians, the reviewer informs us, the views advanced by the Abbé Loisy are still a rare exception.

We doubt whether even Canon J. Armitage Robinson in his *Study of the Gospels* would be prepared to admit the Evangelist's extensive symbolism assumed by the Abbé Loisy. The Canon finds a perfect agreement between the traditions concerning the composition of the Fourth Gospel and the characteristics of the work itself. "An old man, disciplined by long labor and suffering, surrounded by devout scholars, recording before he passes from them his first conception of the life of the Christ, as he looked back upon it in the light of fifty years of Christian experience."[11] Nor does Wendt,[12] in spite of his critical extravagances, dare to defend views as advanced as those of Loisy. He finds, indeed, in the Fourth Gospel, particularly in the speeches of Jesus, traces of older written records which have been worked up by the Evangelist. In this way the critic tries to explain the alleged differences between the point of view of the Evangelist and the recorded speeches of Jesus; and again, between the speeches of Jesus and their historical setting. A good review of Wendt's theory may be found in the January and February numbers of *The Expositor*;[13] for our present purpose it suffices to point out that the use of written documents rather increases than diminishes the historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

But the Abbé Loisy had not as yet fully stated his views on the delicate questions implied in the Gospel problem. Professor Harnack's *Wesen des Christenthums* offered him an opportunity

[10] *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, Febr. 7, 1903, col. 332 f.

[11] *Biblical World*, Jan., 1903, p. 79.

[12] *Das Johannesevangelium*. Göttingen : Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 1900.

[13] 1903, p. 65 ff.; 135 ff.

of a more extensive explanation. Harnack regarded the Christianity of the Gospels as a ready-made system of doctrine. In order to discover its essence, he had only to pare it down to the kernel. But in attempting to do so, the Berlin Professor pared away the best part of the very kernel. The Abbé Loisy, therefore, stepped in to show Harnack the error of his ways. According to the new apologist, the Christianity of the Gospels is a living seed rather than a ready-made system. Christ did not directly institute or organize what constitutes our concrete Church. Neither her outward form as a visible society, nor her hierarchy, nor again her dogmas, nor yet her worship and Sacraments are the direct work of Christ. The Gospel contains the outlines of all this; but all this sprang really into being only through a course of evolution resembling the Hegelian development in most of its essential features. The Church gave itself its hierarchy, its worship, its dogma, because it needed all this in order to live and to win over humanity at large and the Græco-Roman world in particular.

The Abbé reduces his views to the following headings: (1) the Programme of Jesus, or the Kingdom of Heaven; (2) the Person of Jesus, or the Son of God; (3) the Church; (4) Christian Dogma; (5) Catholic Worship. He endeavors to explain historically and psychologically the formation of the Messianic consciousness in the soul of Jesus. The process will shock many and edify few of his readers. We are told that Jesus uttered no dogmatic formula about Himself. As far as Loisy is concerned, it appears to be quite uncertain whether the dogmas of the Incarnation and the Holy Trinity are objects of revelation or products of interpretation. Again, the Gospel contains no theoretic doctrine, and its morality may be summed up in the penance rendered necessary by the imminence of the Kingdom of Heaven. Outside of this kingdom, in which all are to enjoy a divine felicity, the Gospel knows of no society founded on evangelical principles. On account of the nearness of this kingdom, Jesus preached a complete renunciation of all earthly things, and seems to have been adverse even to manual labor. As a matter of course, such a programme was found impracticable at the time of Jesus, and became more so in after times. The theologian, therefore, has the right to adapt it to the condition of his time, but the historian cannot modernize Jesus' idea of the kingdom.

Loisy is, indeed, not alone in urging the importance of the Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus. The last decade has produced quite a literature on Christ's idea of the kingdom. Commonly it has been believed that Jesus regarded the kingdom as both present and future; introduced by Himself among His faithful followers, it develops and grows till it shall reach its ultimate perfection. But the younger generation of scholars is beginning to believe that Jesus taught only an eschatological kingdom. Their view has been well expressed by Bousset:[14] "Together with His contemporaries, Jesus expected the miraculous Kingdom of God. He knew nothing of a transfiguration and transformation of the world through immanent forces. To Him, as to His age, the world seemed only worthy to be destroyed. He taught His disciples to save themselves from the world unto the entirely new conditions that were soon to come." The Abbé Loisy appears to agree with this recent idea of the kingdom; faith makes us candidates of the kingdom; forgiveness of sins and love of God are mere conditions of admission.[15] And what becomes of the Holy Eucharist, what of the Passion and Death of Christ, what of the Resurrection? Since Jesus did not directly intend to establish a new religion or to found a Church, but only to realize the Kingdom of God, He signified by the Holy Eucharist, on the day of its first celebration, the abolition of the existing worship and the approach of the kingdom rather than the institution of a new worship.[16] Again, the idea of an expiation of sin by the suffering of a just man is expressed indeed by the "Second Isaias," but cannot be shown to have been taught by Jesus or believed by the first Christian community; St. Marks' expression "to give His life a redemption for many,"[17] is probably due to the influence of St. Paul's theology.[18] Finally, Loisy is not ashamed to have recourse to the claptrap sophism that a supernatural fact cannot be established by a natural proof; hence neither the Resurrection of our Lord nor His apparitions can produce unequivocal certainty in the mind of the historian.[19]

[14] *Theologische Rundschau.* Heft 10, 11. 1902.
[15] *L'Évangile et l'Église*, p. 19.
[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 181–182.
[17] St. Mark 10: 45.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 71–72.
[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 74–75.

At its very first appearance Loisy's book stirred up in the French religious reviews and papers a lively correspondence. Some writers saw in the publication a triumphant reply from Catholic scholarship to Prof. Harnack's views. Others agreed with the Abbé Gayraud, and found in it a disastrous compromise of the Catholic cause, giving away the substantial identity of Catholicity with the teaching of Jesus. Others, again, followed the Abbé Pierre Dabry, editor of the *Observateur Français*, and denied that the monopoly of loyalty or superior loyalty to the Church belonged to either side of the disputants. Among the calmer publications concerning Loisy's *L'Évangile et l'Église* may be mentioned a review by Father L. de Grandmaison which appeared in the *Études*,[20] a pamphlet by Mgr. Battifol, Rector of the *Institut Catholique* of Toulouse, and a letter to the directors of his seminary by Mgr. Le Camus, Bishop of La Rochelle.[21] Meanwhile, the official custodians of the faith had not been idle. On its first appearance, Card. Richard, Archbishop of Paris, handed the book over to a commission of priests chosen by himself, and, moreover, denounced it to the Roman authorities. On January 17th His Eminence condemned the book as being published without the *imprimatur* required by the ecclesiastical laws, and as seriously disturbing the faith of Catholics on the fundamental doctrines of Catholic teaching, notably on the authority of Scripture and Tradition, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, His infallible knowledge, the Redemption wrought by His death, His Resurrection, the Eucharist, the Divine institution of the Papacy and of the Episcopate.[22] Similar condemnations of the book were issued by the Archbishop of Cambrai,[23] by Card. Perraud, Bishop of Autun, Chalon et Mâcon,[24] by the Bishop of Perpignan, the Bishop of Nancy,[25] and the Bishop of Angers.[26] *La Semaine Religieuse*,[27] brings us the gratifying news that the Abbé Loisy has informed His Eminence, the Archbishop of Paris, of the sup-

[20] January 20, 1903.

[21] *Vraie et fausse exégèse.* Paris: H. Oudin. 1903. 8vo. Pp. 40.

[22] Cf. *The London Tablet*, Jan. 24, 1903; *La Revue du Clergé Français*, Feb. 1, 1903; *New York Sun*, Feb. 22, 1903.

[23] January 20.

[24] January 28.

[25] February 2.

[26] February 6.

[27] Paris, Feb. 7.

pression of the second edition of *L'Évangile et l'Église* which had been about to appear. Let us hope that the author will find it possible to withhold also the English edition of his work, which was announced some time ago. His obedience to the authority of the Church will not lessen his authority as a Biblical and historical critic.[28]

Our anxiety that our English-reading Catholics may not be disturbed by a publication like that of Loisy springs from our experience of the effect produced by similar Protestant publications on the minds of their readers. Philosophies of Religion abound in our days.[29] Among recent works we count at least five popular introductions to the science, at least five collections of essays and lectures on the subject, at least five students' manuals, and at least three guides for advanced students. But to all of these may, in a measure, be applied the strictures pronounced by the Rev. W. Morgan,[30] on Principal Fairbairn's "Philosophy of the Christian Religion." The philosophical principles of these writers stunt their perception and appreciation of the actual historical data of the New Testament. They assume that the Christian religion was not due to the direct influence and teaching of the historical Christ; they base it rather on the interpretation of His person begun by Himself and completed by the Apostles. They begin rather with what the disciples thought about Christ than with the facts in His character and teaching that caused the disciples' impressions. They first assume an historical Christ without Christianity, and then an actual Christianity without a Christ. Our Catholics will not, therefore, be the intellectual or religious losers, if they are spared the necessity of mentally standing on their head in order to obtain an intelligent view of Loisy's inverted image of the Church's origin and development.

PHILOSOPHY.

Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology.[1]—It should not be thought stretching one's expectations too far if one looks upon

[28] Cf. *Études*, Febr. 20, 1903, p. 495 ff.

[29] Cf. *The Expository Times*, Nov. 1902, p. 166 ff.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 75 ff.

[1] Vol. II, edited by Professor M. Baldwin. New York: Macmillan Co. 1903.

the *Dictionary of Philosophy* as opening out a new and higher plane in the development of the sciences. Workers in the field of philosophy and its adjoining regions have long desired a succinct and comprehensive summary of the knowledge which their predecessors had treasured up from the past, and which their co-laborers had ascertained and perfected in the more immediate present. The intense activity of the empirical sciences and the tentative and vacillating character of their results made it too uncertain a venture for an organization of scholars, however well equipped, to set down with anything like accuracy what facts and inferences, outside the nucleus of philosophical truths, had been fairly clarified and established. Nor will one venture to affirm that the time has at length arrived when the physical and biological disciplines are ready to hand over to philosophy so solid and well chiselled a mass of truths that the architectonic science can straightway build it all into its larger structure. On the other hand, if the world is to wait for this ideal stage of intellectual achievement, it may as well fold its hands in apathy, if not in despair. The editors and publishers of the *Dictionary* have done wisely in undertaking the work at the opening of a century so rich in its heritage from the past, and they deserve the congratulations and gratitude of the learned world for the treasures of valuable information they have here accumulated. In its present form it is not of course the final production of its kind. Neither is it without the imperfections associated with most human beginnings. But it is successful beyond the measure of reasonable expectation. Perusing its pages carefully one realizes what a vast amount of painstaking research its contents have demanded of editor and contributor, and how large the financial venture its splendid form has required of the publishers.

We have given a somewhat extended account of the first volume in a former issue of the REVIEW,[2] so that a brief critique of some details in the present volume will suffice. As in the preceding, so also in the volume at hand, the strength of the work centres in the contributions treating of biology, empirical psychology, and the history of philosophy. This is perhaps as it should be, seeing that it is in these departments that investigation has been

[2] December, 1901, p. 202.

in recent times most active, the results most abundant, and on the whole gratifying. Some of the articles on these subjects are elaborate enough to be called essays. Thus, the *Nervous System* receives seventeen pages; *Speech*, twenty-two; *Oriental Philosophy*, forty. Among the subjects of a more speculative character, *Logic*, *Philosophy*, *Probability*, *Proposition*, *Syllogism*, *Space*, and *Time*, have been given proportionally generous treatment.

The Catholic student will of course naturally turn to the topics connected with his religious convictions and will be pleased to observe indications of an effort to deal objectively with them. Thus, for instance, topics like *Purgatory*, *Transubstantiation* and even *Thomism*—subjects as to which there is generally some confusion in the non-Catholic mind—receive clear and adequate definition. At the same time one has to regret the reiterated use in the present, as in the former volume, of the appellation *Romish* in connection with Catholic teaching aud practice. Thus we find "Romish dogmas," in an offensive context, at page 54, and "Romish Church," pp. 133 and 628. Why will the editors of a scientific dictionary permit this term to disfigure its pages? Surely they must know its offensiveness to their Catholic patrons, for even the Century Dictionary indicates this connotation.

Whilst touching upon this delicate matter we cannot refrain from again recording the wish that topics bearing upon our religion had been assigned to Catholic contributors, or at least treated in the light of authoritative sources. The *Dictionary* would thus have secured greater accuracy and authority in its definition of such terms as *Mass*, *Nestorius*, *Sacrament*, *Sacrifice*, *Semi-Pelagianism*, and the like. These terms are as technical in their order as *Neuroblast*, *Somaplasm*, etc., are in theirs, and the Catholic reviewer need not be thought oversensitive or hypercritical if he allude to the inaccuracy and inadequacy of these definitions in a work whose primary object is to secure for usage the opposite qualities, and whose first endeavor it should be to furnish an example in the right direction. Some further illustrations of what is here intended may be given. Thus under the topic *Merit* we read that the Roman Catholic Church "distinguishes between two kinds of merits, that of congruity and that of condignity; or relative and absolute merit. Only Christ Himself can acquire absolute

merit. But a man may by the grace of the Holy Spirit go beyond the strict measure of duty, and may acquire relative merit with God which may under prescribed conditions be transferred to the credit of others." There are several inaccuracies in this passage. In the first place *congruous* and *condign* are not the same as *absolute* and *relative* merit. Absolute merit is here used, as its attribution to Christ indicates, to express what theologians call *meritum rigorosum*, the reward due *ex rigore justitiae*, which is not the meaning of "merit of condignity," as the above passage would lead us to infer. Secondly, the context implies that a man by grace acquires only *congruous* (*i. e.*, in the author's sense *relative*) merit and that only when he goes beyond the strict measure of duty. This is contrary to Catholic teaching. A man may acquire *condign* merit —though not, of course, *ex rigore justitiae*, *i. e.*, absolute merit— even though he go not beyond but adhere simply to the strict measure of duty.

The "essence of the lie" is defined as "resting in the intention to deceive" (p. 4). This is hardly correct, even though it may claim the authority of St. Augustine. As St. Thomas observes: "Quod aliquis intendat falsitatem in opinione alterius constituere fallendo ipsum non pertinet ad speciem mendacii sed ad quamdam perfectionem ipsius" (2. 2. q. 91; a 1). Upon which Sylvius remarks that the nature and species of the lie does not require the will to deceive, otherwise jocose lies, which are not intended for this purpose, but for pleasure, would not fall under the definition. Besides, one who should perform an act in your presence, and should afterwards deny it, would evidently lie, even though he had no wish, as he had no power, to deceive you (Com. in l. c.). The essence of the lie consists in its being a *loquela contra mentem*, from which deception in the mind of another follows as a usual, though not a necessary, consequence. The will to deceive is, therefore, a *property*, not the essence, of the lie, and may be said to be *interpretative* therein. (See Cathrein's *Moralphilosophie*, Vol. II, p. 77.)

The article Macrocosm and Microcosm is not as satisfactory as it might be. The analogy which the ancient naturalists detected in man as the universe in miniature, is portrayed in the crude speculation of the Stoic pantheists and the absurd physics of the

Renaissance. Man, however, was regarded by the nobler of the ancient and mediæval philosophers as a *microcosm*, not because they proportioned the individual soul to the body on the ratio of "the world-soul to the world, nor because they supposed his body to contain the quintessence of cosmical forces, his origin to be sidereal, and his soul to be a spark of the Divine," but because his organism contains the matter and sums up the activities of the mineral, plant, and animal, while his soul constitutes him a "little less than the angel," a possessor of a spiritual nature.[3]

The reviewer may be inclined to treat the articles dealing with Catholic subjects with some allowance and to pass benignantly over minor inaccuracies, condoning them as best he can; but when he comes to the following definition of *Probabilism* he feels his patience considerably strained. What are we to think at finding the following in a Dictionary of Philosophy? Probabilism is "the casuistical doctrine that any opinion held by a recognized doctor of the Church must be regarded as probably correct, and may therefore be safely followed by a layman, who cannot be expected to decide where doctors differ. This doctrine is a logical outcome of *Casuistry* (q. v.). It was first stated by the Spanish monk Molina (1528–81), and was afterwards utilized more especially by Jesuit confessors. The bearings of this doctrine upon the moral life were incisively exposed by Pascal in his *Lettres écrites à un provençal* (1656)." (P. 344.) In the elaborate preface to the first volume of the *Dictionary* the reader is informed of the care bestowed on the preparation and revision of the contents, and the critic reminded that in the exercise of his special function he ought to be modestly mindful of his own unicity over against the editorial plurality. Supposing therefore, as we must, that the foregoing extract passed through the hands of the revising board, one can but conclude that both the writer, Mr. Sorley, Professor of Ethics in Cambridge University, England, and the Editor-in-chief, Mr. Baldwin, Professor of Psychology at Princeton, were unaware of the real meaning of Probabilism. Logically, of course, the extract would justify another conclusion, but the high moral character of the persons concerned forbids our even formulating it. Involun-

[3] *Cf.* Cathrein, *Moralphilosophie*, Vol. I, p. 16.

tarily then the question forces itself, Why did not the author and editors familiarize themselves with the true tenets of *Probabilism* before offering the public the above caricature? Are there not scores—we might say hundreds—of books within easiest access in which the system in question is clearly explained and fully discussed? Why then, again we ask, this caricature in which the *suppressio veri* and the *suggestio falsi* seem to struggle for the first place? We leave the question unanswered. Other queries associate themselves in this connection, such as, for instance, why reference to Catholic works—solid works, easily accessible we mean of course—is so conspicuous by its absence? Why, moreover, was *Neo-Scholasticism* not given a place along with *Neo-Criticism*, *Neo-Hegelism*, and other revived systems of philosophy? A few writers in England and the United States have recently been harking back to Hegel, a few others in France crying "back to Kant." Mention of this phenomenon is thought to deserve a place in the *Dictionary*. Why is it that the efforts of the immense body of Catholic "thinkers"—we take the term from the *Dictionary* (p. 149)—who have been earnestly at work for half a century or more endeavoring to restore to its merited place of honor the greatest system of thought ever created by the human mind, to rid it of its mediæval crudities, and to develop its substantial content, and to assimilate to its organism whatever truths have been discovered by recent science—why, we ask, has no mention been made of this world-wide movement in Philosophy? That its existence did not escape the attention of the editors may be inferred from the fact that the titles of at least five of the periodicals devoted to its interests appear in the list of "abbreviations"—the *Revue Neo-Scholastique*, the *Revue Thomiste*, the *Natur u. Offenbarung*, the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie*, etc., and the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch*. The mention of these titles on the list of abbreviations does not of course imply that the Reviews themselves are cited in the body of the *Dictionary*. As a fact, they are not, as far as we have observed. Nevertheless, they may receive a place amongt the bibliography to which the third volume of the *Dictionary* is to be devoted.

With some determination to find the better side of the *animus* that actuated the *Dictionary*, one might ascribe to

inadvertence the treatment even of the foregoing topics, but what palliation can the most benignant interpreter invent for the following sentence? "On the Jesuitical depreciation of the virtue (of veracity) on the ground that the end justifies the means, see *Equivocation*, p. 761." This is from the pen of Mr. James Seth, Professor of Ethics in the University of Edinburgh. That the statement received the endorsement of Professor Baldwin is manifest from the immediately following portion of the article contributed by himself. Now, in the name of whatever is honest and truthful, is it possible that these two learned professors believe what they here state and imply? Referring to the article *Equivocation* one finds the following:

> The external treatment of morality which distinguished the casuistical moralists (see *Casuistry*) made it easy to defend equivocation and to distinguish it from lying. Thus Sanchez, quoted by Pascal (Lett. prov., ix), says: "It is permitted to use ambiguous terms so that they may be understood in a different sense from that in which one understands them oneself." On the same ground permission is given to mental reservation (*restriction mentale*): "One may swear that one has not done a thing which one has really done, by saying within oneself that one did not do it on a certain day, or before one was born," or even "after having said aloud 'I swear,' one may add to oneself 'that I say,' and then continue aloud 'that I did not do that.'" "And this is very convenient in many circumstances, and always quite correct when necessary for health, honour, or happiness." [Vol. i, pag. 339.]

Can it be that the compilers of the *Dictionary* were unaware of the unreliability of Pascal's citations, that the author of the *Provincial Letters* had barely skimmed over the *Theologia Moralis* of Escobar, as he himself admits, and was unable to verify the citations that had been purveyed to him by the Jansenists? Even Voltaire recognized this fact, and Chateaubriand does not hesitate to characterize Pascal as a calumniator of genius. How is it then that here in the full light of historical and scientific knowledge, and in a work emanating from the foremost centres of learning on the globe, compiled by scholars of world-wide reputation, we find Pascal cited as an authority on this subject?

It is possible, even probable, that neither the contributors nor the editors of the *Dictionary* adverted to the fact that the doctrine here attributed to Sanchez was explicitly condemned by Pope Innocent XI a few years after the death of Pascal.[4] As we

[4] Prop. 27 and 28, damn. d. 2 Martii an. 1679.

observed in our review of the first volume, we have examined carefully the *Opus Morale* of Sanchez and have been unable to discover any trace of the moral obliquities laid by Pascal, and through him by the *Dictionary*, at the door of the eminent Jesuit theologian.

Passing on to other subjects the reader may be surprised at being informed that it was Schleiermacher who "raised practical theology to its true dignity" (p. 321), and that the expression "primum cognitum," designating the primary object apprehended by the human intellect, is a "topic of the most obsolete psychology" (p. 341). His logical wonderment, however, will be more forcefully stimulated by the following remarkable illustration of a syllogism of the first figure given at p. 434:

No P is M
No S is P
∴ No S is M

The printer is probably responsible for the misplacement of the syllogistic capitals and for the ignoring of the *utraque si praemissa neget nil inde sequetur*, as he certainly must be for the superfluous *s* in the Latin word *mathematicis* at page 323 (sub. fin.). Deserving of notice also is the peculiar use of the word *genus* in the teaching attributed to St. Thomas at page 495. "God is absolute, genus and individual . . . each angel is relative genus and individual. . . . But different human individualities have but one *genus*." The Angelic Doctor would probably have used the term *species* for *genus* in these connections.

Criticisms and Notes.

VOTIVE VESPERS AND COMPLINE for the Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year, together with the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, for use in parochial churches. Edited by A. Edmonds Tozer, Knight of the Pontifical Order of St. Sylvester, Doctor in Music of the Universities of Oxford and Durham, etc., etc. With a Preface by Right Rev. Canon James Connelly, Prelate of the Pontifical Household, and Rector of the Church of the Sacred Heart, Hove, Brighton. London: Cary and Co., 231 Oxford Street, W. (Burns & Oates, 28 Orchard Street); Oliver Ditson & Co., Boston, U. S. A.

VOTIVE VESPERS, of Sundays, of the Blessed Sacrament, and of the B.V.M., and Compline, harmonized for four voices and organ, by A. Edmonds Tozer, Mus. D., Oxon. London: Cary and Co., 231 Oxford Street, W.; New York: J. Fischer & Bro., 7 Bible House.

The purpose of these two books, one of which is complementary to the other, is very well set forth in his preface by Monsignor Connelly. It is a matter of common experience that in small parish churches the difficulties in the way of singing the Vespers for the day, as given in the Calendar, prove insuperable, so that what are termed "Popular Devotions" are more and more resorted to as a substitute on Sunday evenings. The Church, however, allows the use, as "Votive Vespers," of the Vespers of any office, such as the Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament, or of the Blessed Virgin. There are few choirs that would not he able to learn one or more sets of unchanging Vespers such as these, and the faithful would have no difficulty in following them. It is for this purpose that these two books have been compiled, and a "Suggested Order of Services according to the Seasons of the Year" shows how a certain variety in the use of them can be obtained. The advantages of the use of the liturgical offices of the Church, which are the Church's own voice of prayer, are obvious. The official Roman Chant, as given in the *Vesperale Romanum*, has been most carefully followed throughout. The anthems of the B.V.M., for four seasons of the year, are given in the "modus simplex" authorized by the Sacred Congregation of Rites.

Attention may be called to the little modulating interludes in the Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament and of the Blessed Virgin. Their presence shows that no point has been overlooked to make the Offices run

smoothly; which would not have been the case, if the new modes had been entered from the old ones without some such passages. When the interludes do not occur, the modes are transposed to follow each other naturally without any tonal hiatus. The harmony employed is diatonic and not overloaded with changed chords. Treble notes, containing the melody, as passing notes over a stationary chord, are freely used. With regard to the system of "pointing" the editor has adopted the principle, "to allow the right quantity of each given word to coincide with what is generally allowed to be an accented note in the plain chant melody." Great praise is due to the enterprising publishing house of J. Fischer & Bro. for bringing out in America so useful a work. It is a notable addition to their already full and excellent catalogue of church music in all schools.

DISCOURSES ON PRIESTHOOD, with Panegyric of St. Patrick. By Rev. W. J. Madden. Edited with additions by the Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 115. Bd. Price, 50 cents.

The five discourses—three on the Priesthood, one on "The Priest in our Time," and a brief but effective panegyric of Ireland's chief Patron Saint—contained in this little volume are models of thoughtful expression. The clear, direct, and well-knit argument, setting forth the excellence and the responsibilities of the priestly office, is clothed in language that challenges criticism. Father Madden's style is not of the poetic, effusive form which has become the rule, at least for panegyrics (for in that category pulpit orators commonly place sermons on the dignity of their order), but it is rather of the John Henry Newman type, in which words stand for thoughts, not simply for emotions. Hence it is that these sermons, or addresses, call forth reflection rather than that momentary fervor which passes with the acclaim. We should recommend them to seminarists and to the clergy, for spiritual reading no less than for individual study as subjects of excellent composition and good oratorical taste.

Father Girardey, to whom we owe thanks for editing these healthy specimens of priestly discourse, adds some "Thoughts on the Celibacy of the Clergy," in order to fill in and round off the general subject of this useful volume. We cannot avoid expressing the wish that, in furnishing the supplement, he had been as judicious as the author whom he introduces and commends. In this we may seem hypercritical, and yet we may believe it to be a matter of importance to direct atten-

tion to a canon of good discoursing which Father Madden so excellently illustrates, but which as if by contrast his editor violates. "The priest, as a true man of God," says Father Girardey, in his supplementary chapter, "should not and cannot be the husband of a wife. Like Jesus Christ, he must be wholly engaged in his Father's business; he must be entirely absorbed in it, and entirely devoted to it. This, however, he cannot do, if he has a wife, for St. Paul says expressly: 'He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things which belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided' (1 Cor. 1: 32, 33). . . . Experience shows that a married clergy sanctify neither themselves nor the people. Not to speak of the Protestant sects, witness the Greek and Russian clergy; they produce no saints either among themselves or among their flocks. They exercise their priesthood as a mere trade," etc.

Now the above words, the pertinence of which gains nothing from the context, are extravagant and only relatively true. St. Paul is indeed quoted correctly, but he also says some other things to the bishops of his own day (I Timothy 3: 2 and 12, and Titus 1: 6), which imply that a married clergy and married bishops may sanctify themselves and their people; and the Holy See, by legislating for the Oriental Churches, and entrusting the clergy and hierarchy with the salvation of souls, not merely as a matter of toleration but by a definite approval of legitimate traditions, emphatically repudiates the idea that a married clergy exercise the priesthood "*as a mere trade.*" If we were speaking only to a body of the faithful who are wholly ignorant of other conditions than those implied by a zealous and virtuous celibate clergy in exclusively Latin countries, the statement would still be of questionable accuracy; but we are living in the United States where there are Greek priests in communion with the Holy See, who are married or who at least recognize as lawful the conditions which permit a non-celibate clergy. Fancy a Greek priest, or an intelligent Greek layman (and there are quite thousands in various parts of the States) being told that their attempt to save souls is "a mere trade." It is not wise even if it were true; but it is not even true, as every student of theology—and to such Father Girardey's remarks are chiefly directed—must in time come to know. Strong generalized statements, such as the very first sentence, "Nothing is more necessary in the world than the Catholic priesthood," defeat the purpose of bringing conviction unless they are modified;

for they are not absolutely and indiscriminately true. To say "Bread and air are more necessary than the priesthood" would be quite as true. But this is a very slight flaw in a very good book which every cleric should own.

AU PAYS DES SYSTEMES. Par H. Tivier. Paris: Victor Retaux, Libraire-Editeur. 1902. Pp. 374.

LA PHILOSOPHIE DU CREDO. Par A. Gratry. Paris: Ancienne Maison Charles Douniol, P. Tequi, Libraire-Editeur. 1902. Pp. 286.

France is not the only "land of systems." The evils, intellectual, moral, and social, that so sorely afflict the French are world-wide, and the remedies proposed by the system-builders have been devised for ills that are confined within no national or even racial limitations. M. Tivier has set to himself the task of analyzing these proposed remedies, to find whether they contain the medicaments for the healing of the nations. Positivism, Humanitarianism, Socialism, Scepticism, Pessimism, and the rest pass through his tests and reveal their inefficacy. Christianity is also examined, and is found alone to contain the elixir of life.

Christianity, however, is confronted in the unbelieving world with certain difficulties—its historic credentials, its central dogmas, their relation to nature, to the mind, to social progress, and other such. These M. Tivier has justly stated and fairly met. On the whole, his analyses and answers will be found helpful and suggestive to the Catholic apologist, not only in France, but wherever anti-Christian systems have to be combated, and the objections of infidelity understood and answered.

In this connection Père Gratry's *Philosophie du Credo* may well be recommended. In his life of the illustrious Oratorian, Cardinal Perraud states that the motive which occasioned the writing of this *exposition raisonée*, as he calls it, was to instruct tbe illustrious General Lamoricière, a quondam companion of Père Gratry at the École polytechnique, one of those *esprits élevés ignorants de la religion*, as the Bishop of Autun characterizes him, who yet are instinctively tormented with the need of faith. The exposition is cast in the form of a dialogue between a priest and an educated layman, and may well be described in the words of Cardinal Perraud as a *Catechisme a l'usage des gens du monde*. It is, therefore, at once solid, and clear and beautiful, and reflects, it need hardly be said, the lofty mind and large

soul of one whose utterances were ever too instinct with the spirit of an Apostle to be restricted in their application to any one day or generation.

TRACTATUS DE DEO UNO. Auctore F. Alexio Maria Lépicier. Parisiis: Sumptibus et Typis P. Lethielleux, Editoris. Pp. xl—567.

DE DEO UNO ET TRINO. By Josepho M. Piccirelli, S.J. Neapoli: Michaelis d'Auria. 1902. Pp. 1419.

As Leo—he who, for so many reasons, deserves the surname of that other Leo who, a millennium and a half ago, wielded the destinies of the City and the World, the Great—surveyed from his recent jubilean days the history of his Pontificate, well nigh commensurate in years with that of Peter, nothing in it all, no act begun, or carried on, or stimulated to higher perfection, must have gladdened more his soul than that which has emanated from his Encyclical *Æterni Patris*. Under the influence of that luminous pronouncement, philosophy and theology have taken on a new life. The beginnings of the Neo-scholastic revival anticipated, it is true, the reign of Leo XIII by a quarter of a century and more, but the movement received a fresh impulse that carried it forward with redoubled speed, from his command and encouragement. We know not whether, among the ceremonies with which his festal days have lately been honored in Rome, a special place was given to a presentation of the visible products of the Neo-scholastic activity that are traceable to the *Æterni Patris*, but certainly nothing could have been more appropriate than to have placed before its venerable author a collection of the works on Theology and Philosophy that derive at least the impulse to their production from that masterful Encyclical. In such a collection of profound and scholarly works, an honored place would certainly be due to the latest arrivals whose titles are given above. No better illustrations of the untiring zeal displayed at the centres of theological science for the spread of Thomistic teaching, and no more patent manifestations of the exhaustless fecundity of that teaching could be found than are offered by these two volumes.

Father Lépicier, who holds the chair of Dogma at the Propaganda, has taken the *Summa* as the basis of his *Institutiones* and, to use his own words, it was to him *solemne sanctumque ne particulam quidem eorum quae in textu singulorum articulorum jacent praetermittere*. To bring out, however, the full meaning of the text, he has thrown upon it the light that may be gathered from the other works

of the Angelic Doctor. To be fully in accord with Leo's intention that the mind of St. Thomas shall be revealed, and placed *en rapport* with the intellectual status of the present day, the author has assimilated to his commentary such materials, arguments, solutions of difficulties, and the like, as are necessary to make the work an efficient instrument in the hands of the modern student.

Father Piccirelli will be known to many of our readers through his work on Theodicy.[1] His present *Disputationes Theologicae* cover in part the same ground, though from a higher viewpoint, and, in addition, the scholastic doctrine on the Trinity. The unusual size of the volume is accounted for by the fact that it contains the literal text of the first forty-three questions of the *Summa* (exclusive of the first question). If, subtracting the space thus occupied, a thousand-paged commentary appear still a formidable book, the student will bear in mind the profundity and breadth of the matter treated and the necessity for abundant development in order to bring out the full content of the Thomistic principles. Besides, in comparison with Father Lépicier's *Institutes* the volume must take proportionately the second place, should the latter author intend to treat the subsequent questions with the generosity he has accorded to the first twelve.

As regards the method of treatment the two works differ somewhat. Father Lépicier keeps close to the Thomistic text, aiming chiefly at its evolution. Father Piccirelli, after a brief commentary on the question under treatment, enlarges on the matter in those generous *Disputationes* which transport the mind at once to the ample fields in which Suarez loves to labor. The material make-up of his volume, with its large clear letter-press, lends itself agreeably to this roominess of treatment.

COMMONWEALTH OR EMPIRE. By Goldwin Smith, D.C.L. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1902. Pp. 82.

COLONIAL GOVERNMENT. By Paul S. Reinsch. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1902. Pp. 386.

However widely one may dissent from the philosophical opinions proposed by Mr. Smith in some of his former books, the present brief essay merits the fullest assent and the warmest commendation. He points to three distinct but convergent forces now arrayed against

[1] *De Deo Disputationes Metaphysicae.* Parisiis: Lecoffre. 1885.

the Commonwealth—Plutocracy, Militarism, and Imperialism—and he sounds no uncertain warning as to the danger they menace. Universal history is made to tell the fate of empires whose greed of gain and power and lust of limitless "expansion" proved their ruin. The author's vision extends far over the political experiences of the past and keenly into the national conditions of the present—especially in the United States, England, and the far East, and from both he augurs that no permanent good, but only inevitable evil can come from the expansion policy of the Government. Though he sees and forbodes the evil, he is no pessimist. This the closing sentences attest: "The sun of humanity is behind a cloud. The cloud will pass away, and the sun will shine forth again. The aged will not live to see it, but younger men will."

Professor Reinsch's *Introduction to the Study of Colonial Institutions* treats of the government of colonies and dependencies simply from a historico-theoretical standpoint. The author has no thesis for or against "expansion." The institutional framework of colonial government is his main subject. The treatment falls under three heads. Under the first the motives and methods of colonial expansion are surveyed in order to bring out the historical view-point. Such topics as movements of population, missionary work, commerce, and communication, capitalistic expansion and the like are discussed. The second part is devoted to the ground forms of colonial protectorates, chartered companies, direct administration, self-government, etc., and the third part to administration, organization and legislative methods emanating from the mother country as well as developing within the dependency itself. Such problems of colonial administration as concern finance, taxation, defence, education, protection of the nations, labor and other similar matters of detail, are not treated in the present work, the author having in view their discussion in a future volume. A valuable feature of the book is its remarkably copious bibliography. Each chapter is supplemented by a list of references to special works, governmental reports, and periodical literature pertinent to the matter under treatment. For the rest, those who have read Professor Reinsch's previous work—*The World's Politics*—will not be disappointed in expecting a like interest and suggestiveness from this more recent contribution to the *Citizens' Library*.

DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY, Including the Principal Conceptions of Ethics, Logic, Æsthetics, Philosophy, of Religion, Mental Pathology, Anthropology, Biology, Neurology, Physiology, Economics, Political and Social Philosophy, Physical Science and Education; and giving a terminology in English, French, German, and Italian. Written by many hands and edited by James Mark Baldwin, Ph.D., etc., Stuart Professor in Princeton University. With the coöperation and assistance of an International Board of Consulting Editors. In three volumes, with illustrations and extensive biographies. Vol. II. Pp. xvi—892. Price, $5.00.

A critique of this volume will be found elsewhere in the present REVIEW (pp. 476–483). Lest, however, the work should there escape the notice of the general reader, or the inference be drawn that it appeals to the needs of only the specialist in philosophy, we call attention to it at this place. The ample description on the title-page sufficiently indicates the scope of the work, and the various disciplines to whose particular interests it is devoted. Apart from occasional inaccuracies in the definitions of subjects essential or related to Catholicism and its philosophy—some of which we have noted in the critique above cited, and aside from a few unjust and offensive inuendos in this connection, the work deserves strong recommendation. Students interested in its various departments will find nowhere else in any language so large a fund of valuable information, so well digested, so clearly expressed, and so invitingly presented.

Literary Chat.

Thomas Baker (London) is about to bring out a new edition of the *Elements of Religious Life*, by Father William Humphrey, S.J. There are to be considerable additions to the work. These are in the main such as refer to the Congregations of Sisters under Simple Vows. The methods of applying for approbation, diocesan incorporation, and, we might say, the canonical status of these institutes in general, have been, as is well known, greatly modified by the Apostolic Constitution *Conditae* and the Decree *Perpensis Temporum* of the present Sovereign Pontiff.

Mr. Bradley Gilman has written a novel entitled *Ronald Carnaquay, A Commercial Clergyman*, which is announced as ready for publication by the Macmillan Company. The hero of the story, who began life, we are told, as a drummer, "enters the Church for what he can get out of it." The story is said to be "probable." We trust that, if it serves no higher purpose, it will aid in generally discrediting the brand of clergymen whose primary occupation and most conspicuous quality is "financeering."

Professor Harris of Johns Hopkins University has reëdited Muir and Ritchie's *Manual of Bacteriology*, which was considered a standard handbook for students of the subject no less in America than in England where it was first issued. The new edition brings the text up to the full requirements of recent scholarship both in the scientific exposition of the matter and in the bibliographical references.

Teachers of American History will be interested in a newly announced historical volume of the Macmillan's Pocket Classics Series. It is to be a collection embracing the more important constitutional and political papers of our national period, published with short historical introductions and with notes by Professor Marshall F. Brown of New York University. The book is designed for use in the public schools.

The centenary of the birth of James Clarence Mangan (born on May 1, 1803) is to be marked by the publication of a new edition (D. J. O'Donoghue, Dublin) of his poems, stories and essays.

Father Eaton of the Birmingham Oratory, who recently visited the United States for the purpose of interesting English-speaking Catholics in the erection of a Church to honor the memory of Cardinal Newman, is the author of several volumes, among which we note *A Book of Oratorios* as suggestive of very beautiful practices in our churches and chapels, especially of Religious, where there is sufficient musical talent to carry out the devotional scheme suggested. We refer to the matter in another part of the current issue of THE DOLPHIN.

Modern Organ Tuning: "the How and Why," is a new work by Professor Herman Smith (Scribner's Sons). The writer lays stress on the system "of Equal Temperament." We mention the work here because it has some bearing on the new edition of *The Harmony of the Religious Life*. "After I had completed the conferences," says Father Heuser, "and allowed the echoes of the last Anthem to pass away, my attention was called to the unequal temperament in the resonance of the Organ. It suggested trouble from the basso parts and trouble from the treble region. Some of the readers to whom the book was addressed thought that the author should have insisted more than he did on the 'superior' notes; they needed the tuning as well as the rest. Others lost their temper because he had undertaken to correct the defects of the Organ in open court. Tuning is always—like the practising of beginners on an instrument—disagreeable to the bystander. He ought to have had respect for the ears of the poor outsiders who need not be made to suffer by the thumping, even if the instrument happens to be out of order."—It was a very unselfish and seemingly just complaint; and so the author went into a self-examination to find whether he should make an explanation. But instead of confessing his fault he disingenuously blames the acoustics showing whence the plaintive sounds come. Such is the meaning and purpose of the new chapter entitled "Acoustics" which has been added to the third edition of the "Harmony."

The first paper in the London *Catholic Book Notes*, edited by Mr. James Britten, K.S.G., deals with modern "Catholic Periodicals." The writer speaks rather deprecatingly of the periodical literature of England. Anyone, he asserts, who will compare the *Tablet* (Catholic) with the *Guardian* (Protestant) of the

English weeklies, must at once realize the inferiority of the former. He then contrasts the British Catholic periodicals with some of the Irish publications, such as Father Russell's small but high-class and most readable *Irish Monthly*, the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, the *Irish Musical Monthly*, and others, which he holds to be much superior to the English monthlies. "It is, however, to America that we must look for the highest standard in periodical literature," continues the writer; and at the head of the five magazines, which he singles out among our American monthlies for especial praise, stands "THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, intended, as its name implies, especially for the Clergy. But its annex, THE DOLPHIN, is for the educated laity, and is well worthy of their support," etc.

We are grateful for the compliment from so good an authority upon the value of correct literature for educated Catholics as is the Hon. Secretary of the Catholic Truth Society, who edits the *Book Notes*. Yet we can hardly concur in the estimate that publications of the present status of the London *Tablet*, the *Month*, the *Dublin Review*, are in a "lamentable state," or that the Catholic periodical literature of England has never been "at so low an ebb as it is now." Our best writers, as both THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN, which Mr. Britten praises especially, will have to testify by their contents, are drawn from England and Ireland. The list of our constant and occasional contributors contains prominently such names as Father George Tyrrell, Father Herbert Thurston, Bishop Hedley, Father Matthew Russell, Dr. William Barry, Father Sheehan, the Rev. W. R. Carson, Father H. Lucas, Dom Mackey, O.S.B., Father Alfred M. Mulligan, Dr. Fr. Lloyd, Dr. T. J. O'Mahony, the late Father Luke Rivington, Dr. H. I. D. Ryder, Father T. Slater, Father Taunton, etc. These names are chosen merely at random from the Index of our magazine, but they occur, we are bound to confess, in the REVIEW (of which THE DOLPHIN is simply a younger shoot) as frequently, or more so, than any American writer of note, if we except very few among our clergy, such as the late Dr. John Hogan, the Rev. F. P. Siegfried (though he rarely signs his name to his excellent work), Dr. H. T. Henry, Dr. Stang, Father Maas, S.J., and a few others. Of story-writers we have indeed a goodly number, especially women; but of writers on topics which demand serious treatment in befitting English style, there is great want in America.

It is amusing, in view of this fact and of what the editor of *Book Notes* says about THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN, that a writer, who signs his full name and home to a recent paragraph of the *Tablet*, should plead that he never heard of THE DOLPHIN. There are, of course, things outside of England that are not known to everybody; but the *Tablet* is cosmopolitan enough, we fancy, to tell its readers about a magazine that has been making twenty-seven volumes of good literature, to which the best of English as well as Continental Catholic scholars have steadily contributed for twelve or thirteen years.

Mr. Edwin Asa Dix has been entrusted by the Appletons (Historic Lives Series) with the biography of Samuel de Champlain, the heroic explorer and founder of Quebec, whose spirit as "Father of New France" still dominates every loyal Canadian. We are not aware that there exists a complete English translation of Champlain's works. It is a matter which the Catholics of America should have at heart.

It speaks well for Irish faith that a mutilated copy of Carslake's Gaelic translation of John Knox's Geneva Liturgy should have brought the large sum of five hundred pounds at a recent London book sale. So rare a volume—and there are only two other copies known to exist—can hardly have been popular except at bonfires on St. Patrick's Eve.

The Benziger Brothers announce for the United States a volume containing biographical sketches of English Cardinals beginning with Pope Adrian IV up to the present time, therefore including Cardinal Vaughan. It is likely to be an interesting series, of historical as well as of personal value to many an Englishman.

Felix Gras, late hero of the romantic school of Provençals, is to have a monument—most likely at Avignon, the old city of the Popes, rich alike in historic memories and in sources of inspiration for genius. Its by-ways speak of reminiscences of Petrarch and of Cola di Rienzi, and the tombs of the Sovereign Pontiffs in its old cathedral tell a sad story of exile. What a fine scene for the historic novel Avignon offers, with the landmarks of its ancient life and struggles still upon it, and its old ways and customs preserved—perhaps, because it is so rarely visited by the modern traveller. They call it the "windy city"; yet how strangely unlike it is to Chicago.

Father Devine, the Passionist, author of many spiritual and doctrinal books, among which are best known his *Ascetic Theology*, *The Creed Explained*, *The Commandments Explained*, and *The Sacraments Explained* (published by R. & T. Washbourne), has very nearly completed a volume on *Mystic Theology*.

The English translation of the fifth volume of Gueranger's Liturgical Year, entitled *After Pentecost*, is about to be issued. Another translation, part of the series "The Saints," published in French under the direction of M. Joly, is that of St. Theresa. The biography is from the pen of the editor, who also wrote the Life of St. Ignatius and the Psychology of the Saints. To judge from advance proofs sent us the English translation is a most entertaining as well as instructive addition to the already published volumes of the series. It is issued from the press of Turnbull and Spears, Edinburgh (Benziger Brothers).

Some of our Catholic papers stated, without sufficient warrant, that the subscriptions to the Cardinal Newman Memorial Fund had been closed owing to the unexpected recall of the Rev. Father Eaton, of the Oratory, to Birmingham where his presence is urgently needed just now. We are authorized to state that the subscription list continues open and is placed under the personal patronage of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons. The names of donors of sums over ten dollars (addressed to the Rev. Robert Eaton, St. Patrick's Rectory, 242 S. Twentieth Street, Philadelphia) will be published from month to month in the official list of subscribers in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, and also in THE DOLPHIN.

Students of Irish History will look with eagerness for Father d'Alton's History of Ireland, about to be published in three volumes. The work is to be issued by subscription, three dollars net for the first volume.

Readers of Father Dignam's *Daily Thoughts* will be pleased to find a companion volume to the little manual of spiritual suggestions in Father Clare's, S.J., *A Voice that is Still*, just published (Burns & Oates).

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

La Sainte Bible Polyglotte. Par F. Vigouroux. Ancien Testament. Tome III—Les Paralipomènes, Esdras, Néhémie, Tobie, Judith, Esther, Job. Paris: A. Roger et F. Chernoviz, Editeurs; 7, Rue des Grands-Augustins, 7. Montreal: Librairie Granger, 1603, Rue Notre-Dame. 1902. Pp. 838.

The Psalms and Canticles. In English verse. By the Right Rev. Bishop Bagshawe. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. vii—354—v. Price, $1.25 *net.*

The Sacrifice of the Mass. An explanation of its Doctrine, Rubrics and Prayers. With an Introduction by the Rev. M. Gavin, S.J. London: Burns & Oates (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers). 1903. Pp. 176.

Institutiones Juris Ecclesiastici quas in usum scholarum scripsit Jos. Laurentius, S.J. Cum Approbat. Rev. Archiep. Friburg. et Superior. Ord. Friburgi, Brisg.: B. Herder (St. Louis, Mo.). Pp. 680. Price, $3.50.

Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie. Publié par le R. P. Dom Fernand Cabrol, Bénédictin de Solesmes, Prieur de Farnborough (Angleterre). Avec le concours d'un grand nombre de collaborateurs. Fascicule I.—A-Ω.—*Accusations contre les Chretiens.* Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1903. Pp. 287.

The Linear Measures of Babylonia, about B. C. 2500. A paper read at the meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society. By the Rev. W. Shaw-Caldecott. With Appendix on the "Biblical Cubit: a new suggestion." (Reprinted from the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund Society for January, 1902.) Hertford: Printed by Stephen Austin & Sons. 1903. Pp. 45.

Wahre und falsche Reform. Rede d. Hochw. Dr. Paul W. von Keppler, Bishof v. Rottenburg. Dritte vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg (St. Louis, Mo.): B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 40. Price, $0.70.

Pastoral Letter on "Catholic Unity," By the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Martin Garcia Alcocer, Bishop of Cebú, and Administrator Apostolic of Manila *sede vacante.* Reprinted under the auspices of the Augustinian Fathers, Lawrence, Mass. Boston: Marlier & Co. 1903. Pp. 93. Price, $0.10.

Das Wesen des Christenthums an einem Beispiel erläutert; oder "Adolf Harnack und die Messiasidee." Vortrag v. Prof. Karl Braig, Doct. Phil. et Theol. Freiburg im Breisgau (St. Louis, Mo.): B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 40. Price, $0.11.

La Diplomatie Pontificale au XIX Siècle. Par le P. Hilaire Rinieri, S.J. Traduction de l'abbé J. B. Verdier. Le Concordat entre Pie VII et le Premier Consul (1800-1802). Paris: Librairie P. Lethielleux. 1903. Pp. xxxi—649. Prix, 6 francs.

Breviarium Romanum ex Decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum, S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi jussu editum, Clementis VIII, Urbani VIII auctoritate recognitum. Romae—Tornaci: Typis Societ. S. Joannis Evangelistae; Desclée, Lefebvre & Soc.; Milwaukee: Prostat apud Wiltzius & Soc. 1903. Pretium, $6.50.

Anchoresses of the West. By Francesca M. Steele (Darley Dale); with Preface on Mysticism by the Very Rev. Vincent McNabb, O.P. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Sands & Co. 1903. Pp. xxii—261. Price, $1.00 *net.*

Eucharistic Elevations. By the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, O.M.I. London: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row; New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1902. Pp. 91. Price, $0.30 *net.*

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE. Ad usum Confessariorum compositi et soluti ab Augustino Lehmkuhl, Casus de Theologiae moralis principiis et de praeceptis atque officiis Christianis speciatim sumptis. Friburgi Brisgoviae: Sumptibus Herder. 1903. Pp. 566. Price, $2.40 *net.*

DIE MESSE IM DEUTSCHEN MITTELALTER. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens. Von Adolph Franz. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. St. Louis, Mo. 1902. Pp. xxii—770. Price, $4.15 *net.*

PRECES GERTRUDIANAE. Vera et sincera medulla precum, potissimum ex revelationibus BB. Gertrudis et Mechtildis excerptarum. Editio nova, accurate recognita et emendata a monacho ordinis S. Benedicti congregationis beuronensis. Cum approbatione Rev. Archiep. Friburgensis et superiorum ordinis. Cum imagine. Friburgi Brisgoviae (St. Louis, Mo.): Sumptibus Herder. 1902. Pp. xviii, 275. Price, $.25.

SOCIAL QUESTION.

HEREDITY AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. By Simon N. Patten, Wharton School of Finance and Economy, University of Pennsylvania. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1903. Pp. vii—214. Price, $1.25.

THE POPE AND HIS PEOPLE. By His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. London: Catholic Truth Society, 69 Southwark Bridge Road, S. E.; New York: Benziger Brothers, 36 and 38 Barclay Street. Pp. 288. Price, $0.45 *net.*

LE ROI DU JOUR—L'ALCOOL. Par Edouard Hamon, S.J. Paris: Ancienne Maison Charles Douniol, P. Téqui. 1903. Pp. 138.

MISÈRES HUMAINES. Causeries Familières sur quelques défauts et vices des Familles. Par Edouard Hamon, S.J. Paris: Ancienne Maison Charles Douniol, P. Téqui. 1903. Pp. 316. Prix, 3 fr.

LETTERS A UN PROTESTANT. Par l'Abbé Snell, du clergé de Genève; avec une Préface de S. E. le Cardinal Perraud, Évêque d'Autun, Membre de l'Académie française. Paris: Ancienne Maison Douniol, P. Téqui. 1903. Pp. xli—207. Prix, 2 fr.

FAITH FOUND IN LONDON. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 28 Orchard Street W. 1902. New York: Benzinger Bros. Pp. 160. Price, $1.10 *net.*

THE ANTIDOTE. By the Rev. John Gerard, S.J. London: Catholic Truth Society, 69 Southwark Bridge Road, S. E. 1902. Pp. 135. Price, $0.45 *net.*

PURE SOCIOLOGY. A Treatise on the Origin and Spontaneous Development of Society. By Lester F. Ward. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co. 1903. Pp. xii—607. Price, $4.00.

MISCELLANEOUS.

ANDREW'S BOTANY ALL THE YEAR ROUND. By E. F. Andrews, High School, Washington, Ga. Cloth, 8vo, pp. 302. Price, $1.00. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company.

THE UNRAVELING OF A TANGLE. By Marion Ames Taggart, author of "Loyal Blue and Royal Scarlet," etc. New York, Chicago, Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 146.

RIDINGDALE STORIES. By David Bearne, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. xii—380. Price, $1.50 *net.*

CATHOLIC BOOK NOTES. Established 1897. Edited by James Britten, K.S.G., Hon. Secretary Catholic Truth Society. Price One Penny monthly, or 1s. 6d. per annum, post free.

THIRTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL IN PHILADELPHIA, situated at Thirty-ninth and Filbert Streets. And Thirtieth Annual Report of the Ladies' Aid Society. January 20, 1903.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—MAY, 1903.—NO. 5

TWO HYMNS FOR THE ASCENSION.

FOR the student of Latin letters the Roman Breviary is a casket containing the fairest gems of hymnologic literature, and a surprisingly large number of them as well. But large as that collection is, it hints but faintly at the vast stores of mediæval hymnody. Although the Breviary contains two lovely hymns for the great feast of the Ascension, we have thought our readers would be pleased to have two quaint examples of hymns, not in the Breviary, illustrating the joyousness of the feast. The first of these, *Hymnus canamus gloriae*, is ascribed with very great probability to the Venerable Bede. It found such favor as to be included in Continental as well as English hymnaries, and has received at least four translations into English. The second hymn, *Coelos ascendit hodie*, is ascribed by Dr. J. M. Neale, the eminent Anglican hymnologist, to the twelfth century; by Duffield and March, to the fifteenth century; and Daniel, in his *Thesaurus* (I, p. 343) extracted his text "ex Hymnario Watislaviensi a. 1754. Interserta est textui latino versio Germanica Mich. Franckii 'Gen Himmel aufgefahren ist'." The two hymns differ greatly in treatment, the solemn organ-like rhythms of Bede contrasting strongly with the lighter melody of the unknown author of the later hymn.

IN ASCENSIONE DOMINI.

(*Saec. VIII.*)

Hymnum canamus gloriae,
Hymni novi nunc personent,
Christus novo cum tramite
Ad Patris ascendit thronum.

Apostoli tunc mystico
In monte stantes chrismatis,
Cum Matre clara Virgine
Jesu videbant gloriam.

Quos alloquentes angeli :
Quid astra stantes cernitis ?
Salvator hic est, inquiunt,
Jesus triumpho nobili.

Da nobis illuc sedula
Devotione tendere,
Quo te sedere cum Patre
In arce regni credimus.

Tu esto nostrum gaudium,
Qui es futurus praemium ;
Sit nostra in te gloria
Per cuncta semper saecula.

ASCENSION HYMN.

(*Venerable Bede?*)

A hymn of glory let us sing;
New be the songs of triumphing:
For Christ, by a new path, hath gone
To God, and to His throne.

With Mary, the Disciples met
On mystic Mount of Olivet;
They saw the wonder, and adored
The glory of the Lord.

To whom the angel-message given:
"Why stand ye looking up to Heaven?
This Jesus Who hath left you, thus
Shall come all-glorious."

O Saviour, draw our hearts above
With strongest bands of faith and love:
There, seated at the Father's side,
Thou dost forever bide.

Be Thou our joy on earth, dear Lord,
Who shalt in Heaven be our reward:
Let all our glory be in Thee
While countless ages flee.

ALLELUIA.

(*Auct. Ignoto.*)

Coelos ascendit hodie,
Alleluia :
Jesus Christus, Rex gloriae,
Alleluia.

Sedet ad Patris dexteram,
Alleluia :
Gubernat coelum et terram,
Alleluia.

Jam finem habent omnia,
Alleluia :
Patris Davidis carmina,
Alleluia.

Jam Dominus cum Domino,
Alleluia :
Sedet in Dei solio,
Alleluia.

In hoc triumpho maximo,
Alleluia :
Benedicamus Domino,
Alleluia.

Laudetur sancta Trinitas,
Alleluia :
Deo dicamus gratias,
Alleluia.

ALLELUIA.

(*Twelfth Century?*)

He mounts the heavens triumphing,
Alleluia:
Christ the Saviour, glorious King,
Alleluia.

He sitteth at the Father's right,
Alleluia:
And ruleth heaven and earth with might,
Alleluia.

Thus Father David's wondrous psalm,
Alleluia:
Hath ended in the conquering Lamb,
Alleluia.

My Lord now reigneth with the Lord,
Alleluia:
Upon the Father's throne adored,
Alleluia.

On this triumphal day of days,
Alleluia:
Sing to the Lord your hymns of praise,
Alleluia.

Unto the Trinity be laud,
Alleluia:
Thanksgiving make we unto God,
Alleluia.

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook Seminary.

THE CODE OF HAMMURABI AND THE CODE OF MOSES.

IT is only a few years since the Biblical world was electrified by the discovery of portions of the Hebrew text of the Book of Ecclesiasticus. That such a text must have existed was known, but its recovery seemed hopeless. Similarly, Oriental students knew that a code of laws published by Hammurabi, king of Babylonia, had existed; fragments indeed were in our museums; but the recovery of the Code itself had hardly been dreamed of. Hammurabi was king of Babylonia and has long been known as the sixth king of what is commonly held to have been the first Babylonian dynasty, which covered the years 2454–2151 B.C. He himself reigned fifty-five years according to one account, forty-three according to another. His influence upon Babylonian life and history probably exceeds that of any other sovereign, and during the last few years his correspondence has been published and commented on by Mr. King of the British Museum. It is some years now since Professor Schrader suggested his identity with the well-known Amraphel of Genesis 14—an identification which at the time was looked on with not unnatural suspicion. Thus Dr. Sayce wrote in 1894: "It is not easy to find a Babylonian equivalent for the name of Amraphel;" and again: "It is difficult to find a resemblance between the names (Hammurabi and Amraphel), and the attempts of Assyriologists to transmute Amraphel into Hammurabi, or Hammurabi into Amraphel, have not been very happy. The problem is one which it must be left to the future to solve."[1]

This identification, however, of Hammurabi with the Amraphel of Genesis 14 is now accepted on all hands. Thus Professor Sayce wrote in 1897: "Khammurabi . . . must be identified with Amraphel, who is stated in the Old Testament to have been king of Shinar or Babylonia, and we can approximately fix the period when the family of Terah emigrated from Ur of the Chaldees. It was about 2300 B.C., if the chronology of the native Babylonian historians is correct."[2]

This date, it is true, conflicts with the traditional Biblical

[1] *The Higher Criticism*, p. 166.

[2] *Early History of the Hebrews*, p. 12.

chronology, which would require us to assign the year 1921 as the probable date for Abram's arrival in Canaan. Hommel has suggested that the two dynasties given in the Babylonian king lists A and B are really in inverse order, and that that of which Hammurabi is the sixth in succession should really be the second and not the first. This dynasty would then date from about B.C. 2150–1783. This would be very convenient, and it is perhaps something more than mere hypothesis.[3]

Dr. Pinches writes in 1902: "The identification of Hammurabi or Ammurabi with the Amraphel of Genesis can hardly admit of doubt."[4] And a full discussion of the question may be found in Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition.*

However, we are not concerned here with the question of Hammurabi's identity, but with his "Code." In January, 1902, the French explorations at Susa, conducted by M. de Morgan, resulted in the discovery of a block of diorite about eight feet high, on which was engraved a representation of Hammurabi receiving his code of laws from the sun-god. On the two sides of the stone are thirty-three columns of laws. Five more had unfortunately been obliterated, presumably by the Elamite conqueror who carried away this treasure from Babylonia and who probably intended to grave on the space thus rendered vacant his own name and titles. It is a pity he did not do so, as we should thus have been able to learn more of the history of the stone.

In October, 1902, P. Victor Scheil, O.P., Professor à l'École des Hautes Études, published a full translation of the Code. This was followed by a translation from the hand of Hugo Winckler, the German Orientalist; and now Professor C. H. Johns, Lecturer in Assyriology, Queen's College, Cambridge, has published the literal translation of the text with a copious Index.[5]

Twenty years ago, the discovery of an old Babylonian Code of Laws, dating from about 2300 B.C., would not have been

[3] *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 118 ff. For Hommel's subsequent views see Rogers' *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. i, p. 339.

[4] *The Old Testament in the Light of the Records of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 218.

[5] *The Oldest Code of Laws in the World.* T. & T. Clark. Price, 1s.6d. *net.*

hailed by Biblical students as likely to throw much light on the Mosaic legislation. The Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, however, have opened our eyes to the immense influence which Babylonia exercised over Egypt and Syria, and Professor Sayce, in his recent Gifford Lectures on the Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia, has shown good grounds for holding that Egypt even owed much of her religion to Babylonia.

We should, therefore, hold it antecedently probable that this ancient Code of Laws would throw considerable light upon the Biblical Codes; but we venture to say that no scholar ever anticipated so close an approximation between the two codes as actually exists. Now modern criticism has shown that it is possible to distinguish with tolerable certainty "layers" of laws in the Pentateuch, and of these the section Exodus 20: 24—23 *ult.*, and 24: 3–8, to which has been given the name of the "Book of the Covenant," is generally held to be the most ancient. Be this as it may, it is precisely with this section that "The Oldest Code of Laws in the World" affords the most striking parallels. Some of these parallels we have given at length in the pages which follow, and we have added two more from Deuteronomy; but the reader should take his Bible and the "Code," and read them together, passage by passage, if he would convince himself of their marvellously intimate connection.

Laws Touching Theft or Dishonesty.

I.—*Exod. 22.*

1. If any man steal an ox or a sheep, and kill or sell it: he shall restore five oxen for one ox, and four sheep for one sheep.

§ 8. If a man has stolen ox, or sheep, or ass, or pig, or ship, whether from the temple or the palace, he shall pay thirty-fold. If he be a poor man, he shall render tenfold. If the thief has naught to pay, he shall be put to death.

The severity of the fine exacted by the "Code" is remarkable, but still more so the difference between the restitution demanded of the rich and of the poor. This difference appears throughout and shows us the tone of humanity which undoubtedly prevailed at the period. The similarity of the wording of the two codes is striking. It should be noticed, however, that in the "Code" the

sanctity of the place whence the object was stolen enhances the guilt, and consequently the amount of punishment, and no case touching mere theft occurs, though as a receiver of stolen goods is to be punished with death, presumably the thief would receive the same punishment.

Again, carelessness regarding another's property committed to one's care is the subject of similar legislation in both codes:

II.—*Exod. 22.*

10. If a man deliver ass, ox, sheep, or any beast, to his neighbor's custody, and it die, or be hurt, or be taken by enemies, and no man saw it;

11. There shall be an oath between them, that he did not put forth his hand to his neighbor's goods: and the owner shall accept of the oath; and he shall not be compelled to make restitution.

12. But if it were taken away by stealth, he shall make the loss good to the owner.

13. If it were eaten by a beast, let him bring to him that which was slain, and he shall not make restitution.

§ 125. If a man has given anything of his on deposit, and where he gave it, either by house-breaking or by rebellion, something of his has been lost, along with something of the owner of the house, the owner of the house who has defaulted, all that was given him on deposit and has been lost he shall make good and render to the owner of the goods; the owner of the house shall seek out whatever of his is lost and take it from the thief.

III.—*Exod. 22.*

2. If a thief be found breaking open a house or undermining it, and be wounded so as to die: he that slew him shall not be guilty of blood.

3. But if he did this when the sun is risen, he hath committed murder, and he shall die. If he have not wherewith to make restitution for the theft, he shall be sold.

4. If that which he stole be found with him, alive, either ox, or ass, or sheep: he shall restore double.

§ 21. If a man has broken into a house, one shall kill him before the breach and bury him in it.

Here the Biblical legislation is fuller, and enters more deeply into the casuistry of the question. Summary justice marks the "Code" throughout, and the frequency of the death penalty for cases of injustice is not the least noteworthy characteristic of this ancient piece of legislation. No less than seventy-eight various offences are pronounced capital.

Damages to Property.

Exod. 22.

5. If any man hurt a field or a vineyard, and put in his beast to feed upon that which is other men's: he shall restore the best of whatsoever he hath in his own field, or in his vineyard, according to the estimation of the damage.

§ 57. If a shepherd has caused the sheep to feed on the green corn, has not come to an agreement with the owner of the field, without the consent of the owner of the field, has made the sheep feed off the field, the owner shall reap his fields, the shepherd who without consent of the owner of the field has fed off the field with sheep shall give over and above twenty Gur of corn per Gan to the owner of the field.

Here again the similarity of the wording should be noted, as also the exact fine which the "Code" lays down. Indeed, the difference being the two codes may be broadly stated as that between an inchoate and a long-established system. The Babylonian Code indicates a large body of "Common Law," which has been reduced to practice. Many individual concrete cases must have gone to its making, and the experience of many judges and magistrates is here condensed. In the Pentateuchal Code, broader principles are laid down, definite fines are rarely imposed, concrete instances have not yet arisen, and society is not yet sufficiently crystallized to allow of more precise legislation.

Trustees.

Exod. 22.

7. If a man deliver money, or any vessel unto his friend to keep, and they be stolen away from him that received them: if the thief be found he shall restore double;

8. If the thief be not known, the master of the house shall be brought to the gods, and shall swear that he did not lay his hand upon his neighbor's goods.

§ 102. If a merchant has given to the agent money as a favor, and where he has gone he has seen loss, the full amount of money he shall return to the merchant.

§ 103. If while he goes on his journey the enemy has made him quit whatever he was carrying, the agent shall swear by the name of God and shall go free.

The "Code" draws a distinction between the culpable negligence of the trustee and the case where no robbery was to be anticipated. But the point to be noticed is the expression "shall swear by God," which frequently occurs, *e. g.*, in §§ 120, 126, 131, 240, and 266. The parallel in Exodus is remarkable: "he shall be brought to the gods (אלהים, R. V. "God," and in margin, "judges;" *cf.* Ps. 81: 1 [82]), "and shall swear."

Manslaughter and Mutilation.

Exod. 21.

12. He that striketh a man with a will to kill him, shall be put to death.

13. But he that did not lie in wait for him, but God delivered him into his hands; I will appoint thee a place to which he must flee.

14. If a man kill his neighbor on set purpose and by lying in wait for him: thou shalt take him away from my altar, that he may die.

15. He that striketh his father or mother, shall be put to death.

16. He that shall steal a man, and sell him, being convicted of the guilt, shall be put to death.

17. He that curseth his father, or mother, shall die the death.

18. If men quarrel, and the one strike his neighbor with a stone or with his fist, and he die not, but keepeth his bed:

19. If he rise again and walk abroad upon his staff, he that struck him shall be quit, yet so that he make restitution for his work, and for his expenses upon the physicians.

20. He that striketh his bond-man or bond-woman with a rod, and they die under his hands, shall be guilty of the crime.

21. But if the party remain alive a day or two, he shall not be subject to the punishment, because it is his money.

§ 202. If a man has struck the strength of a man who is great above him, he shall be struck in the assembly with sixty strokes of a cow-hide whip.

§ 203. If a man of gentle birth has struck the strength of a man of gentle birth who is like himself, he shall pay one mina of silver.

§ 204. If a poor man has struck the strength of a poor man, he shall pay ten shekels of silver.

§ 205. If a gentleman's servant has struck the strength of a free-man, one shall cut off his ear.

§ 206. If a man has struck a man in a quarrel, and has caused him a wound, that man shall swear "I do not strike him knowing" and shall answer for the doctor.

§ 207. If he has died of his blows he shall swear, and if he be of gentle birth he shall pay half a mina of silver.

§ 208. If he be the son of a poor man he shall pay one-third of a mina of silver.

We have contrasted these two pieces of legislation as much for the differences between them as for their similarity. The meaning of the word "strength" in §§ 202–205 may be divined, and it is to be noticed that the only parallel to this is furnished by Deut. 25: 11–12. At the same time it may mean "the crown of his head." The interest, however, of the section of this "Code" lies in the fact that no provision is made for wilful murder, but only for manslaughter, and on this latter point the parallel between the two Codes is astonishing. Thus:

I.—*Exod. 21.*

18. If men quarrel, and the one strike his neighbor with a stone or with his fist, and he die not, but keepeth his bed:

19. If he rise again and walk abroad upon his staff, he that struck him shall be quit, yet so that he make restitution for his work, and for his expenses upon the physicians.

§ 206. If a man has struck a man in a quarrel, and has caused him a wound, that man shall swear "I do not strike him knowing" and shall answer for the doctor.

We might almost say that Moses was commenting on Hammurabi! And so again:

II.—*Exod. 21.*

20. He that striketh his bond-man or bond-woman with a rod, and they die under his hands, shall be guilty of the crime.

21. But if the party remain alive a day or two, he shall not be subject to the punishment, because it is his money.

§ 208. If he be the son of a poor man, he shall pay one-third of a mina of silver.

Here the impartiality of the Mosaic Code marks its superiority, though at the same time due regard is had to the loss incurred by the owner of the slave. Again:

III.—*Exod. 21.*

16. He that shall steal a man, and sell him, being convicted of the guilt, shall be put to death.

§ 14. If a man has stolen the son of a freeman, he shall be put to death.

The immediate sequel to this in Exodus is the case of a miscarriage brought on by some man's violence, and it is no slight index of the dependence of the Biblical Code upon that of Hammurabi that the same sequence is observed in the latter code, though the connection between the two cases is not in itself so close as to make one the necessary sequel to the other. Moses either had the "Code" before him, or else he and his auditors were thoroughly familiar with it, and, consciously or unconsciously, he founded his legislation upon it. Thus, in Exodus we read immediately after the question of manslaughter:

IV.—*Exod. 21.*

22. If men quarrel, and one strike a woman with child, and she miscarry indeed, but live herself: he shall be answerable for so much damage as the woman's husband shall require, and as arbiters shall award.

23. But if her death ensue thereupon, he shall render life for life.

§ 209. If a man has struck a gentleman's daughter and caused her to drop what is in her womb, he shall pay ten shekels of silver for what was in her womb.

§ 210. If that woman has died, one shall put to death his daughter.

§ 211. If the daughter of a poor man through his blows he has caused to drop that which is in her womb, he shall pay five shekels of silver.

§ 212. If that woman has died, he shall pay half a mina of silver.

§ 213. If he has struck a gentleman's maid-servant and caused her to drop that which is in her womb, he shall pay two shekels of silver.

§ 214. If that maid-servant has died, he shall pay one-third of a mina of silver.

The minute details into which the Code enters on this subject, contrast remarkably with the Bible, which makes no distinction between rich and poor. The injustice of § 210, by which the daughter of the wrong-doer is to lose her life, is avoided by the Mosaic legislator, who elsewhere lays down the opposite doctrine.

Deut. 24.

16. The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor the children for the fathers, but every one shall die for his own sin.

V.—*Exod. 21.*

24. Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot,

25. Burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.

§ 196. If a man has caused the loss of a gentleman's eye, his eye one shall cause to be lost.

§ 197. If he has shattered a gentleman's limb, one shall shatter his limb.

§ 200. If a man has made the tooth of a man that is his equal to fall out, one shall make his tooth fall out.

It is here, perhaps, that the two codes most closely approximate, and it is hard to resist the impression that the legislation of the Book of the Covenant is directly founded upon the older "Code." Concrete instances are not given as in the "Code," but

the principle which runs through the latter is taken for granted by the Mosaic legislator. Sections 25, 26, 236, 245, 263, etc., should be noticed on this point.

The Bible, however, proceeds here to draw that distinction between classes which is persistent in the "Code," but rare in the inspired legislation.

Exod. 21.

26. If any man strike the eye of his man-servant or maid-servant, and leave them but one eye, he shall let them go free for the eye which he put out.

27. Also if he strike out a tooth of his man-servant or maid-servant, he shall in like manner make them free.

The Case of a Savage Ox.

A very close parallel between the two codes is furnished by the question of damages for injuries inflicted by a savage ox.

I.—*Exod. 21.*

28. If an ox gore a man or a woman, and they die, he shall be stoned: and his flesh shall not be eaten, but the owner of the ox shall be quit.

§ 250. If a wild bull in his charge has gored a man and caused him to die, that case has no remedy.

II.—*Exod. 21.*

29. But if the ox was wont to push with his horn yesterday and the day before, and they warned his master, and he did not shut him up, and he shall kill a man or a woman: then the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death.

30. And if they set a price upon him, he shall give for his life whatsoever is laid upon him.

§ 251. If the ox has pushed a man, by pushing has made known his vice, and he has not blunted his horn, has not shut up his ox, and that ox has gored a man of gentle birth and caused him to die, he shall pay half a mina of silver.

III.—*Exod. 21.*

31. If he have gored a son or a daughter, he shall fall under the like sentence.

32. If he assault a bond-man or a bond-woman, he shall give thirty sicles of silver to their master, and the ox shall be stoned.

§ 252. If a gentleman's servant, he shall pay one third of a mina of silver.

Here again we feel inclined to exclaim: "Moses commenting on Hammurabi!"

The Undutiful Son.

Deut. 21.

18. If a man have a stubborn and unruly son, who will not hear the commandments of his father or mother, and being corrected, slighteth obedience:

19. They shall take him and bring him to the ancients of his city, and to the gate of judgment,

20. And shall say to them: This our son is rebellious and stubborn, he slighteth hearing our admonitions, he giveth himself to revelling, and to debauchery and banquetings:

21. The people of the city shall stone him: and he shall die, that you may take away the evil out of the midst of you, and all Israel hearing it may be afraid.

§ 168. If a man has set his face to cut off his son, has said to the judge, "I will cut off my son," the judge shall inquire into his reasons; if the son has not committed a heavy crime which cuts off from sonship, the father shall not cut off his son from sonship.

§ 169. If he has committed against his father a heavy crime which cuts off from sonship, for the first time the judge shall bring back his face; if he has committed a heavy crime for the second time, the father shall cut off his son from sonship.

The legislation of the Bible strikes us at once as much more severe than that of Hammurabi. In both cases, however, the son is to be brought before the judge, but it is only in the Biblical legislation that death is declared to be the penalty for the undutiful son.

Divorce.

Deut. 24.

1. If a man take a wife, and have her, and she find not favor in his eyes, for some uncleanness: he shall write a bill of divorce, and shall give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.

§ 142. If a woman hates her husband and has said "Thou shalt not possess me," one shall inquire into her past what is her lack, and if she has been economical and has no vice, and her husband has gone out and greatly belittled her, that woman has no blame; she shall take her marriage portion and go off to her father's house.

§ 143. If she has not been economical, a goer about, has wasted her house, has belittled her husband, that woman one shall throw her into the waters.

The Bible takes it for granted that the case against the wife is proved; not so the "Code," which concedes a greater degree of independence to the wife, and which contrasts favorably with the interpretation put on the words of Deuteronomy by Hillel, who allowed divorce if the wife "spoiled the roast" or proved a poor cook!

Divorce was easily obtained, and the section given above shows that the wife could commence proceedings, a position which the Mosaic dispensation and, as far as we know, Jewish tradition, did not seem to contemplate. At the same time incest is strongly reprobated; thus, in sections 154, 155, 157 and 158, the penalties are severe; "that man one shall expel from the city"; "that man one shall bind and cast her into the waters" (the translation here is vague); "one shall burn both of them together"; "that man shall be cut off from his father's house."

Our object has been to bring out, if possible, the indebtedness of the Pentateuchal legislation, more especially that of the Book of the Covenant, to this ancient Code of Laws; but it would be wrong to leave this interesting fragment of antiquity without referring to two further points, namely, the light it throws upon several passages of the earlier books of the Bible, and its tone of civilization, humanity, and refinement.

Several obscure points in Genesis now appear clearer. For instance, the relationship between Sarah and Agar.

Sarah and Agar.

Gen. 16.

4. But she perceiving that she was with child, despised her mistress,

5. And Sarai said to Abram: Thou dost unjustly with me: I gave my handmaid into thy bosom, and she perceiving herself to be with child, despiseth me. The Lord judge between me and thee.

6. And Abram made answer, and said to her: Behold thy handmaid is in thy own hand, use her as it pleaseth thee. And when Sarai afflicted her, she ran away.

§ 146. If a man has espoused a votary and she has given a maid to her husband and she has borne children, afterwards that maid has made herself equal with her mistress, because she has borne children, her mistress shall not sell her for money, she shall put a mark upon her and count her among the maidservants.

In accordance with this, the Biblical account adds:

Gen. 16.

7. And the Angel of the Lord having found her, by a fountain of water in the wilderness, which is in the way to Sur in the desert,

8. He said to her: Agar, handmaid of Sarai, whence comest thou? and whither goest thou? And she answered: I flee from the face of Sarai, my mistress.

9. And the Angel of the Lord said to her: Return to thy mistress, and humble thyself under her hand.

So, too, Reuben's crime, Gen. 35: 22, and its punishment, Gen. 49: 3–4, find their exact counterpart in § 158: "Si quis, post patrem suum, deprehensus sit in gremio ejus quae eum nutrivit et filios peperit, iste e domo patris sui praecindatur."

The sound common sense of the "Code" cannot fail to strike even the most careless reader. Humane and generous provisions are the rule, and it is only rarely that our modern sensitiveness is offended, as for instance in § 110: "If a votary, a lady, who is not living in the convent, has opened a wine shop or has entered a wine shop for drink, that woman one shall burn her."

The high tone of morality and the genuine civilization evinced in these laws may be brought into startling prominence by perusing the following page from Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century:* ". . . to steal a sheep or a horse; to snatch a man's property out of his hands and run away with it; to steal to the amount of forty shillings in a dwelling-house, or to the amount of five shillings 'privately' in a shop; to pick a man's pocket of any greater sum than twelve pence; to steal linen from a bleaching ground, and woollen cloth from a tenter ground; to cut down trees in a garden or in an orchard; to break the border of a fishpond so that the fish may escape, were all crimes punishable with death."

We need only contrast with this such sections of the "Code" as the following: § 259: "If a man has stolen a watering-machine from the meadow, he shall give five shekels of silver to the owner of the watering machine." A mild penalty in a land where irrigation was the life of the soil.

Again, § 59 reads, in marked contrast to one of the savage enactments just mentioned, "If a man without the consent of the owner of the orchard has cut down a tree in a man's orchard, he shall pay half a mina of silver."

And for sound sense, take § 235: "If a boatman has navigated a ship for a man and has not made his work trustworthy, and in that same year that he worked that ship it has suffered an injury, the boatman shall exchange that ship or shall make it strong at his own expense, and shall give a strong ship to the owner of the ship."

Again, Mr. Lecky writes: "On the other hand it was not a

capital offence for a man to attempt the life of his father; to commit premeditated perjury, even when the result was the execution of an innocent man; to stab a man, however severely, provided the victim did not die from the wound; to burn a house in which the incendiary had a lease, even if it was so situated as to endanger the lives of hundreds. It was a capital offence to steal goods to the amount of forty shillings from a vessel on a navigable river, but not from a vessel on a canal. To steal fruit already gathered was a felony. To gather it and steal it was only a trespass. To break a pane of glass at five in the afternoon for the purpose of stealing something that lay in the window was a capital offence. To break open a house with every circumstance of violence in summer, at four o'clock in the morning, was only a misdemeanor."[6]

Capital Punishment.

In the Code of Hammurabi we find twenty-eight capital offences. England in the eighteenth century contrasts unfavorably with this: "Previous to the Revolution the number (of capital offences) in the statute book is said not to have exceeded fifty. During the reign of George II sixty-three new ones were added. In 1770 the number was estimated in Parliament at 154, but by Blackstone at 160; and Romilly, in a pamphlet which he wrote in 1786, observed that in the sixteen years since the appearance of *Blackstone's Commentaries* it had considerably increased."[7]

Probably, no one would now choose the medical profession on the terms prescribed in Babylonia. Note the following penalty:

"§ 218. If the doctor has treated a gentleman for a severe wound with a lancet of bronze and has caused the gentleman to die, or hasopened an abscess of the eye for a gentleman with the bronze lancet and has caused the loss of the gentleman's eye, one shall cut off his hands!"

The jerry-builder, too, had a hard time of it under Hammurabi.

"§ 229. If a builder has built a house for a man and has not made strong his work, and the house he built has fallen, and he

[6] *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. vii, chap xxi, p. 317.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 316.

has caused the death of the owner of the house, that builder shall be put to death."

"§ 233. If a builder has built a house for a man, and has not jointed his work, and the wall has fallen, that builder at his own cost shall make good that wall."

It should not be necessary to point out that such a dependence of the Biblical legislation on a Babylonian code of laws in no way derogates from the authority or Divine character of the former. It only serves to bring into greater prominence the too often forgotten distinction between Revelation and Inspiration. The former is a Divine bestowal of new facts; the latter is a Divine illumination falling upon already existing data, which the author is Divinely moved to commit to writing. And startling though the close connection may be, it should be noted that it only affects a small portion of the Biblical legislation.

HUGH POPE, O.P.

Hawkesyard Priory,
Rugeley, Staffordshire, England.

IN FATHER MARTIN'S LIBRARY.

WE were sitting one evening, as was our custom, in Father Martin's library, discussing the Education Bill for Ireland, when our genial neighbor, Father Purtel, who had charge of a small French-Canadian parish in the town, entered the room. He was all radiant, and holding up an unbound volume, cheerily said: "I have got something good here, Father Martin, something you are sure to like, I know; and if this young curate of yours gets a dose of it, it will make him walk the chalk-line."

"What is it?" asked the good old pastor, whose amiability and exemplary habits of life would have sufficed to make any ordinary priest living in his company anxious to do his duty. He was fond of books and, apart from a good library, kept on his table the more serious periodicals in English and French, so that one found him generally well informed on all that pertained to ordinary culture of mind and heart.

"*À la Porte de Paradis,*" said Father Purtel, as he settled down in a vacant chair under the lamp near the table. "I have

just dipped into it and find it excellent reading, likely to prove a good substitute for meditation or spiritual reading, in which department of pastoral or ascetical life I have never been quite suited, though I have bought a score of volumes which the Fathers of St. Sulpice recommended to us at the retreats."

"*À la Porte de Paradis?*" queried Father Martin. "That sounds like the title of a prayer-book. What is the special merit that recommends the volume? It is French, of course; but let me have a glance at the contents."

"Oh," answered the Canadian priest, "I'll read you a chapter of it and that will tell you best what the book is like. One of the first things I came upon, on opening it this afternoon, was a story about l'Abbé Martin. 'This is good,' I said to myself. "If it is not a perfect photograph of my friend at St. Bridget's—Father Martin, if you please—it will fit his curate, who is, I understand, next on the list for promotion to a vacant country parish, and against whom I have a little grudge for drawing all the poor people away from my parish by his unpardonably big heart."

Father Purtel, who with a ready intelligence spoke English and French equally well, opened the book, and without further preface read, translating (which he did for my benefit) with freedom and ease, so that it seemed as if he had actually an English text before him. The story was one of many which pictured a parish priest arriving at the gate of paradise and there meeting St. Peter to take the account of spiritual assets for the redeeming of a certain mortgage upon an estate willed to him in perpetuity (under equitable conditions) at his baptism.

The following is the story as Father Purtel read it, with here and there some comments, I suspect, of his own inserting, whilst we both listened attentively to the end.

The abbé Martin was the pastor of what the world calls a respectable though not very large parish in a border diocese of the Dominion. Nobody had a bad word to say of him. Had there been any cause, the busybodies of the neighborhood, whose eyes and ears were open and whose tongues were rarely known to keep a Sabbath, would soon have discovered and propagated it for the wider diffusion of pastoral theology. But they all

knew that he said his Mass, baptized the children on Sundays, preached a sensible sermon—not too long and never aggressive, buried people according to their means, and kept peace with the commune. When there happened to be trouble he was wise enough to keep out of it, smiled his condolence when he heard of it on his return home, and had a good word for everybody. Even the publicans of the parish felt that they were in duty bound to pay their pew rent and to take an interest in the periodical fairs necessary to defray the extra expenses of the parish service, which was, of course, better than if they had sworn at the priest and declared that they would go to the devil openly; and if they could not attend Mass during the busy days of their hard-worked lives, they were sure to make no opposition to attending their own funeral, provided it had been properly arranged for by their relatives with the good-natured pastor. He had no parochial school, but then there was a good public school close to the church; and as his liberal views and broad-minded charity helped to elect the directors—though he never voted with either party himself—he had no difficulty in getting the children on Sundays and holidays for the catechism, which he made quite interesting to the little ones and to the teachers who helped him on these days. As to his house—it was a model home for a bachelor. The guardian of his domestic comforts had the canonical age and a half-witted girl to help her. The latter the priest had taken for charity's sake, as somebody was needed in the kitchen; and then he saved expenses by the arrangement. A superannuated clerical student who had lost his hearing and hoped to get it back (in which case he was to resume his studies) acted as general factotum in and about the premises. And there was a dog, a little overfed, wherefore he never barked. His name was "Watch," but he slept most of the time, for he, too, was deaf, seemingly out of sympathy for the clerical sexton who nourished and occasionally petted him.

Such was the abbé Martin in his parochial setting; irreproachable and kind. Accordingly the people appreciated him; in fact, some called him a "saint," one of the rubicund sort; but that was the only kind they knew, because it was so much like the figure they saw every Sunday in the transept window near the altar, which had been there from the time when the church had first been built.

The Bishop did not trouble the abbé Martin, because the abbé Martin did not trouble the Bishop; at least not since his appointment to the present parish in which he had expected to find rest. Indeed the abbé was not an ambitious man, and if, contrary to his anticipations, a mitre and the choice of an escutcheon had been offered to him, he would most likely have accepted the charge with quiet resignation, and selected for his motto the words of the Apostle: "His contenti sumus." This excellent quality of a contented temper the abbé Martin had inherited from his father, to whom in the main he owed the choice of his vocation. The old man had worked hard for a number of years, and when finally he compared the amount of his savings with the amount of labor and energy expended on his part he did not feel assured that he could manage to get much of rest or comfort in his old age. He looked upon his boy, to be sure, with hopefulness, but there was no certainty as to the future of the lad, who might set up a homestead of his own as soon as he had found another half to match his good self; in which case he might let the old folks manage for themselves. Besides, the elder Martin did not want the junior to slave as he himself had done, with no better prospect in life.

One day after a christening in the parish, Jacques Martin, senior, came home unusually happy—and then he slept a little. When in the evening the lad had gone to bed, the two keepers of his earthly destiny sat beside the chimney talking over the neighbor's newly-baptized child, very naturally the question of young Jacques' future came up before them.

"I'll tell you what, mother, why can't we make a priest of him? There's old Berton's son almost a canon, and what was he before he went to the Petit Seminaire? I have often thought to myself in church sitting behind the old man, who wipes his glasses as if he were the Lord Mayor and a Doctor of Laws: Berton, thou didst shrewdly; a priest's berth for your son—why it's a mortgage on heaven and earth together. If I could do things over again, I'd try for the Seminary myself."

"Very amiable of you," said his wife, feeling somewhat hurt. But he smoothed it over, and she, too, rather liked the idea of Jacques being an abbé, and so they resolved to put the matter before the parish priest. The result was that the boy was sent to

the preparatory school in Montreal with a view of entering the Seminary. In later years it occurred to the youth, now and then, especially at retreats, that he did not have that particular fervor, that spirit of self-denial, love of holy things and devotion, of which spiritual books make mention as the marks of a true vocation to the priesthood. But when he spoke of the matter once or twice to those who were interested in him, he was made to feel that leaving the Seminary would put him in disgrace; that he was as good as other boys, and better than some of them; and that the Seminary authorities would surely point out his duty in the matter if there were need of it. And so he stayed, moving mechanically forward without serious breaches of discipline, such as might have called in question his vocation with those who judge of outward conduct and leave the responsibility with the candidate who after mature deliberation asks for Holy Orders.

Having been ordained, the young priest was appointed to the chaplaincy of a conservatory. He had to say Mass every day, for which he received a moderate stipend, furnishing a slender income.

"My son," said the father, who was proud of the cassock in the family, "how long does the Bishop intend to leave you in that 'Home?' I imagine you are made for better things, and besides, this work is bad for your health."

Accordingly, young Father Martin bethought himself and applied at the first occurring vacancy for a curate's place. He obtained it, and for a time all went very well; he had work enough to do, and there was company to fill the hours of leisure agreeably. Still a man's greatest privilege is his liberty, and a curate is a man. What haunted him was the desirability of a certain amount of independence necessary to develop character and to secure peace and contentment—"Quaere pacem et persequere eam," said his breviary. And so he did, by soliciting the rectorship of a parish sufficiently large to remove all temporal solicitude. In the meantime the elder Martins had been honorably interred in the old graveyard of their native parish, and if the anniversary of their death had not indicated some doubt on the part of Father Martin as to *their* complete rest, he at all events found nothing to disturb his own peace of mind. Oh, yes, there

was an occasional break in the quiet, which I had almost forgotten. The abbé Martin was possessed of a parrot. The parrot's name was Peter (Pierre), and Peter had a way of creating a racket without regard for times or persons, and sometimes he disturbed the slumbers of the worthy parish priest, who was in the habit of taking a noonday siesta upon the smooth pillow of an unruffled conscience. In sometimes awakening the abbé Martin unexpectedly from his repose, Peter acted in a somewhat prophetic manner, as we shall presently see.

Now it came to pass that one morning the whole town was excited over the announcement that the good parish priest of St. Maurice had died during the night. There was a large funeral, all the clergy of the deanery and many others having come to attend. The dean himself preached, praising his dead brother and asking the prayers of the congregation, "since everybody has some blemishes to atone for." Their deceased pastor was perhaps waiting at the threshold of Paradise, expecting the zephyrs of their grateful intercession to swing ajar the gates that separate heaven from purgatory.

And in reality it was so. The abbé was actually waiting, as the preacher said. But there was a miscalculation about the zephyrs. Even if they had blown very hard—(which is not the way with such soft, gushing winds)—they could not have moved the solid doors securely locked against the ingress of any one who has not the express approval of St. Peter.

At the gates of Paradise the abbé Martin had arrived, conducted by some swift spirit who did not give him any opportunity to ask questions. If there was some terror in the abbé's heart, because the winds were howling like demons as he passed through the dark clouds heavenward, he had nevertheless confidence in his record. To be sure, there, all along the wall of adamant that guarded the confines of heaven, he recognized his old parishioners—Jean Littlechete, the scrupulous grocer; Mrs. Fairtender, who always managed the bazaar, giving her time and lingual graces to the success of the Church mendicant; then there was wealthy old Bonpay, who used to have the gout on Sundays due to his trying excursions among the tenants from whom he collected rents; somewhat in the background the abbé discovered

the form of Monsieur Liberall, who mostly presided at the parish meetings; there were the two pious brothers Dozinpew, and the clever advocate, Monsieur Hardlin Sermons. Very uncomfortable appeared Captain Boirbien wedged in between the sharp-nosed Miss Sevèr, the great temperance pleader of the town, and rosy Monsieur Le Tadmas, for whom the doctor had prescribed long sleeps on Sundays because he kept a wine establishment. The abbé understood Boirbien's situation, as he remembered how the Captain used to irritate the publican, especially on Saturday nights by running up generous accounts with the expectation that the merchant would endorse his candidacy for mayor, the only way in which he might get a settlement for the wine bills against the Captain. There were young folks like Miss Rondanse and—to his surprise—also some of the laborers and their wives and kindred with whom he had hardly expected to be thrown into company even in the next world. The loads which these poor forgottens were carrying seemed to be less weighty than those of the more distinguished people on the line who had not been used to such treatment on earth.

Now when the abbé saw the numerous host of his former flock, witnesses of his integrity, he felt more assured than he had been, for in spite of his conscious innocence there was a sort of continuous tightening, as if the air around him got denser and hotter in proportion to his approach toward the home of the saints. But what had he to fear? Here were the people to whom he had given generous passports to heaven, and it surprised him to find that they had met with any delay. To be sure, his through-tickets had been provided mostly at short notice; and in the scrambling for position as they arrived in their sleeping coaches at the heavenly depot there might have occurred some mistakes, preventing their immediate admission. Most of them seemed to have too much baggage; others . . . But *he* was there now and would see to it that things were righted. He tried to look as friendly as of yore and to catch the eyes of his old parishioners, the wives of the banker and brewer. Somehow or other they did not look up or could not, for they were all on their knees with very heavy loads keeping down their necks; and perhaps it was as well, because the abbé felt that his attempt at looking pleasant was a most

desperate struggle, and a failure at that. He felt there was something amiss, and was, by force of habit, searching for his glasses to make certain of the situation, when suddenly he heard a trumpet-like voice whose tones seemed to convey the peremptory order: "Advance, Monsieur l'Abbé. St. Peter awaits you."

And there stood the Saint, with the keys attached to his girdle, and an angel holding a closed book on which was emblazoned in letters that seemed to burn with living meaning: "Jacobus Martin, parochus ecclesiae St. Mauritii, confessor non pontifex."

"Correct," said the abbé, comforting himself, and bowing very low to St. Peter, at the same time attempting to give the angel a second bow, not feeling quite sure as to what amount of patronage the winged witness might exercise in the matter now approaching. "I am ready for the examination, Most Holy Father Peter; ask me about the observance of the Commandments and the precepts of the Church founded upon the rock St. Peter, and I am sure you will be satisfied with my course on earth, short as it was."

Slowly, and as if the words were weights of eternity, the Saint spoke: "Your life, priest and pastor Jacobus, is here recorded. As a private man, naught is marked against you. But you assumed the duties of another state of life."

"These," replied the Abbé, with some trembling in his voice, "I have fulfilled with general exactness; for, realizing that I lived by the altar, I made all proper efforts to earn the living to which I was appointed. My breviary I recited every day, sometimes I even anticipated Matins and Lauds. My Mass"—

"You said it daily," interrupted the Saint,—

"Every Sunday," replied the priest.

"You preached and taught the children, you anointed the dying, you buried the dead. You did what any man equally endowed with the privilege of ordination, and wishing to guard his good name among men, would have done. It required neither faith, nor charity, nor zeal. Pride, or a sense of self-sufficiency, or fear of human censure, or the desire to escape remorse of conscience would have prompted this fidelity in any man. Look down upon the world, and see how many thus regard duty. It did not require the teaching of the Gospel doctrine of self-denial and the Cross to accomplish this."

"But these works of self-denial are of supererogation; they are really evangelical counsels, Holy Father," faltered the abbé; "I believed that the first virtue is moderation, and confined myself to the commandments and precepts which cover the law of duty and charity." But the words vanished.

Then the angel unfolded the pages of the book. On one side were the assets—the talents, the graces, the opportunities whereby a parish priest laboring with zeal among the people would lay the foundations of a virtuous commonwealth; the traditions whereby souls would be guarded against ruin for generations to come; the conversions which God's providence had designed, and which needed but the suggestive encouragement of the priest to accomplish great results for the advancement of religion and the diffusion of good morals; the prudent devices by which scandals that were threatening could be prevented, by which native animosities were to be softened through gentle interference; the prayers of the faithful united under a good shepherd that were to avert certain calamities from which the community was suffering; the little children whose hearts were ready to be moulded into sanctuaries for life, to the joy of angels and the edification of men, if the pastor would turn the energies and time which other men wasted upon aimless pursuits and in quest of needless relaxation, to the building up of a school in which religious teaching and practice served to cultivate pious habits and Christian character; the methods by which he might forestall the sad results of mixed marriages, seeds of endless misery through the loss of faith, affecting whole communities, and multiplying their destructive effects upon endless generations,—all of which could be changed into blessings through wise direction at the time when the first symptoms of a misplaced affection appeared under the eyes of the pastor.

On the opposite page the dimmed eye of Father Martin saw the luminous summary of all the losses resulting from the neglect of these gifts, opportunities, and invitations of grace. It was clear to him in an instant. In cases where God had expected from the pastor the vigilance of a shepherd, there had been thoughtlessness and indifference resulting from a false view of his vocation and a misapprehension of his priestly and pastoral duties. He

had not sinned in malice—and for this sole reason he whom his parishioners had held to be a good man, was not lost as an enemy of God. But the responsibility which he had so lightly assumed, the loads which he had shirked in the light of his day, were now to weigh upon him with the awful consequences of expiatory justice.

There were many pages in that book which the angel bore; some white, more gray and deeply dyed. These marked the years that lay between the death hour and the day when young Martin, of his own free will, ascended the altar steps to accept, together with the sacred chrism of Ordination, the duties of a ministry that stood apart from every profession and trade by the demand it made upon the candidate of self-sacrifice for the good of souls committed to his care. And as the angel read out the account, revealing the standing of the pastor toward his parishioners, these turned toward him as his accusers. With humility born of a humiliating condition, and yet with the awful severity that comes of justice and which convicts of guilt without extenuation, they were to discharge upon their former pastor the burdens that so heavily depressed them. "If your instructions had warned me," said one who had been a man of influence under the abbé's pastoral care, "I should have avoided a danger which I suspected, but which your words and conduct minimized. You preached to us of toleration, of the brotherhood of man, of patriotism; and there were times when you told us what a great gift faith was, and that sin was an evil, and that St. Maurice had been a good soldier, and that St. Michael was very beautiful from the beginning, and that the devil had a grudge against the angels. You praised our generosity when Christmas came, and you never corrected anyone, except when you scolded the poor peasants who blocked the aisle in the back of the church on the day the Mayor came in for the Queen's service. You allowed the Masonic agencies to draw your parishioners into their socialistic meetings, to canvass amongst us literature hostile to faith and sound morals, and to solicit the votes of our people for their political candidates, who pleaded public reform while living in open divorce and sustaining their claims by undisguised bribery. To these representatives of public opinion we gave our support, because Monsieur le Curé thought well of it,

and reminded us that the gilded candlesticks on the altar and the silver service on the parochial sideboard, and sundry other benefactions of a more perishable nature, betokened the generous faith and hope of the political candidates, who must surely love the Church to be so good to its pastor, even though they were not often to be seen in it."

The story was a long one, yet it appeared very brief, since there was here no measure of time as men are accustomed to it on earth. At the end of his charge our good parishioner seemed very much stronger than at first; the pouring forth of his tale of woe had relieved him, and he gradually raised himself, grasping firmly the two upper corners of the heavy sack he bore. And now appeared in plain sight what Monsieur l'Abbé had not noticed before, namely, a label on the sack, which read:

"IN TRUST FOR FATHER MARTIN."

Quite suddenly, and without apparent difficulty, the load rolled over upon the shoulders of the abbé, who thereupon assumed a more humble posture than he had done before.

But the end was not yet. The long line of burdened figures that stood in front of the abbé, all seemed to have waited for him. As he had come upon the scene he had at first recognized only the more prominent of his old parishioners at the end of the long row. They were familiar faces, because he had often dined with some of them, or had sat with them at a little game to pass away the time, or they had sipped with him a bottle of mild wine—and in such things, they say, there is "truth"—so that it (the bottle of wine) serves many people as a kind of substitute for the gospel-book, alternately soothing and rousing the spirit and creating bursts of fervor and speech. But now there appeared many whom the abbé had never known before or noticed on earth. They were the nearest to the gate of which St. Peter held the key; but from the way they moved forward, and from the increased groans in the distance, it seemed that there were continually new arrivals from the parish lately vacated by the abbé Martin.

The wearisome litany of pastoral neglects was being chanted in all sorts of keys. Christine, the old washerwoman, had attended daily Mass for years, and it had given her comfort in her toilsome

life. But since the abbé Martin had come to the parish the Mass was sometimes late, sometimes there was none; people were sensible of a lack of reverence in the way the Mass was said; and when the devotions were recited in May and October, it was done in a droning and perfunctory manner. So Christine gradually stayed away because she could not afford to be late with the people who employed her, and the morning service had ceased to attract her as it had done of old. Others felt and thought the same. The abbé Martin never urged them to come; he rarely said anything except generalities to his penitents in the Confessional. To the sick he gave absolution and the last sacraments, and told them that now he had "done everything that he *could* do for them" and recommended them for the rest to the mercy of "le bon Dieu." Some of the parishioners whom the abbé had canonized at their funeral, had found the *advocatus diaboli* at the end of their journey, and were now anxious to have the abbé take up their cause.

Thus there came tumbling upon the astonished parish priest load after load until he seemed fairly smothered, whilst the sweat was pouring from his brow furrowed with anguish. Mercy! mercy! he cried from beneath his burden, creeping as best he could on his knees in the direction in which he saw the long procession of his parishioners move after they had relieved themselves of their charges. By and by there was a lull; they had all disappeared. Others might come; but for the present the judgments ceased, and, moreover, the abbé Martin had as much to bear as he could endure without being completely crushed. Anxiously he looked toward the end of the long and ascending path which led to the coveted home of rest for the weary. Oh, it was hopeless to try it! Should he ever get there? How he longed for the prayers of the little children who had been too young to be given over to the training in the secular school, and who had been taught the rudiments of faith and devotion under the care of a young peasant girl whom the pastor had thought too simple to employ for any better purpose.

Slowly, slowly did he move on his penitential pilgrimage. It now seemed to take centuries to advance even a step; there was time for reflection and for regret, and every now and then when the prayers of the Church appeared to have momentarily lifted

the awful weight, new charges came and fresh loads from the old parish. Would it ever, ever stop? . . .

At last, after long and weary struggles as of one submerged in suffocating waters, the abbé reached the threshold of his hopes. Surely the angel of mercy that attends the throne of God would open the gate for him now at the bidding of St. Peter, when the Saint should see the humble plight of the priest, the parish priest once so much honored and respected among his people, a member of the glorious army of secular clergy, who despite some mistakes in the matter of vocation and responsibility, still had a claim—as one coming from the same county (a Roman, of Gallic connection only slightly Americanized)—upon the primatial ruler of the Church to which the abbé belonged. Here was the gate of Paradise; he could kiss its foot-sill, touch it with his hands. He endeavored to raise his eyes, to look up; for although the gate was not very wide, it was quite high, and the bars were above the reach of anyone that could not stand upright. But the abbé crept on, craning his neck, until after long efforts he saw a luminous inscription in the upper panel which read—alas!

"NO ENTRANCE HERE FOR PEOPLE WITH LOADS!"

ARTHUR WALDON.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.

AT the close of the first quarter of the fourth century, the three hundred and eighteen Fathers assembled at Nice, reaffirmed, in what has ever since been known as the Nicene Creed, "the Faith once for all delivered to the saints." As set forth by the Council, this Creed ends abruptly at the ninth article. "There was question then of Arius, not of Origen," says St. Jerome, "of the Son, not of the Holy Ghost. The Fathers affirmed what was denied, and passed over in silence what no one called in question."[1] So, too, the Anglican Blunt, at page 175 of his *Theological Dictionary:* "The Nicene Creed as preserved to us by Eusebius, breaks off with the words, *and in the Holy Ghost*, as being

[1] *A Pammach. et Ocean.*, ep. 84; c. 4 (Migne, tom. 22, col. 747).

all that was germane matter to the pending controversy; but, within a few years Epiphanius supplies to us the fuller form as the Creed of the Church of Cyprus, which was reproduced almost verbatim by the Council of Constantinople." Epiphanius, in fact, (*Ancoratus*, 118) cites the fuller form as the Symbol "prescribed by the three hundred and ten odd" in the Nicene Council, assuming, certainly not without reason, that the Fathers neither would nor could curtail the ancient Creed of the Church.

It needs not, however, the testimony of Epiphanius or of Rufinus (who attests the agreement of the Eastern with the Western formulary in all but one or two trifling details) to assure us that the Creed of Nice is no new Creed. He who runs may read and see for himself that this is but a second edition, with explanatory notes, of the ancient formulary which St. Leo the Great commends to us as "the Catholic and Apostolic Symbol." Article for article, though not word for word, they are one and the same. The later Creed is but an elaborated form of the older and simpler one. The same features, cast in their primitive mould, still look out at us familiarly from their new and more ornate setting.

Now, this ancient and simple Creed, twin-sister of the Old Roman Symbol, nay, the very counterpart and *alter ego* of it, existed in the East from the first. The frame-work of it was the same Trinitarian Formula; it comprised twelve articles; it was a Baptismal Creed as well as a Rule of Faith and test of orthodoxy. St. Athanasius admires the fabric of it, wherein the "so great glory of the Most Holy Trinity is set forth in twelve distinct phrases," and declares that to "add to or take away aught from it were a sacrilege."[2] Eusebius cites the epistle sent by the Synod of

[2] *De Profess. Reg. Cathol.*, ad init. This work, written in Latin and purporting to be a translation, is set down as genuine in the edition of the works of St. Athanasius published at Paris in 1726, and republished at Cologne sixty years later. The citation given above is made from the later edition. Migne (P. G.) decides against its genuineness, and ascribes it to Idatius. Migne (P. L.) shows that "Idatius" does but hide the identity of the real author, whom he makes out to be Vigilius of Thopsus, an African by birth, who flourished in the latter half of the fifth century. Driven from his see by the Arian Vandals, he took up his abode in Constantinople for a season, and there wrote a book against Eutyches. *Cf.* Migne, P. L., tom. 62, cols. 94 and 493. The work from which the citation is given above is in the form of a dialogue between Athanasius and an Arian heretic. Vigilius may well make Athanasius speak of the Baptismal Creed as "setting forth the so great glory

Antioch, in 268 A.D., to Pope Dionysius, in which Paul of Samasota is condemned as having "departed from the Rule of Faith and embraced a spurious doctrine."[3] The implication is that the Rule of Faith was the same in the East as in the West, the same at Antioch as at Rome. But the Roman Church never knew of any Rule of Faith, never recognized any Rule of Faith, other than the Apostolic Symbol. The profession of Faith presented by Arius and Euzoius to Constantine, some sixty years later, is still the ancient Symbol of the Church, with the seventh and eleventh articles left out, the second expanded somewhat, and the tenth thrown into the last place, as we find it also in a sermon (215) attributed to St. Augustine.

"We believe," they write, "(1) in one God the Father Almighty, (2) and in Jesus Christ His Son, who was born of Him before all ages; God the Word, by whom were made all things in heaven and earth; who descended, (3) and was made man; (4) who suffered, (5) and rose again, (6) and ascended into heaven; (8) and is to come again to judge the living and the dead, (9) and in the Holy Ghost, (12) the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life of the world to come and the kingdom of heaven; (10) and in the one Catholic Church of God, which extends from end to end of the earth."[4]

of the Most Holy Trinity in twelve distinct phrases." The Council of Nice framed no new Creed, nor did it, as we have seen, set forth all the articles of the old and unwritten Creed of the Catholic Church. This was from the first and continued to be, in the words of Leo the Great, *duodecim apostolorum totidem signata sententiis*—recognizable as Apostolic by its having the Apostolic number of articles. The Fathers of Nice did but declare more clearly and fully the meaning of the ancient Creed by way of safeguarding "the Faith once for all delivered to the saints." Hence, despite the fact that the Roman Church still clung to her ancient Symbol, the same Leo, writing to the Emperor Leo, could say with truth, "There is no question but that we preach and defend the same Faith which the holy Synod of Nice confirmed, declaring: *We believe in one God the Father Almighty.*" (Epis. 165, Migne, tom. 54, col. 1159).

Further evidence of the existence in the East, long before the time of the Nicene Council, of a Baptismal Creed held to be of Apostolic origin, is to be found in the *Didascalia*, whence Zahn has conjecturally restored it. The *Didascalia*, as Burn observes, was written in the third century, probably not far from Antioch. It attributes to the Twelve the composition of the Creed. There is no trace here of Western influence, writes Burn, after citing a passage from it, "Yet we find a Trinitarian Creed traced back to an Apostolic Council." (*An Introduction to the Creeds:* Appendix F.).

[3] *Hist. Eccl.*, lib. 7, c. 30.

[4] Socrat. *Hist.*, l. 1, c. 26; Sozom. *Hist.*, l. 2, c. 27.

In the writings of St. Basil we have abundant evidence of the existence in the East, from the very earliest times, of this primitive Ante-Nicene Creed. At the outset of his work against Eunomius, he says that if all upon whom the name of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ was invoked "had been content with the tradition of the Apostles and simplicity of the Faith, there would have been no need at this time of our discourse."[5] He cites Eunomius as saying.

"The more simple and common Faith of all who wish to appear or to be Christians, to state it in a condensed and compendious form, is as follows: We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, from whom are all things; and in one only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things; and in one Holy Ghost, the Paraclete."

Eunomius here gives us expressly to understand that he is presenting but "a summary and compendium" of the primitive Creed. Plainly it was a Baptismal Creed, based upon the same Trinitarian Formula as the Old Roman Symbol. He appeals to it as "that pious tradition which prevailed from the first amongst the fathers as a kind of gnomon or rule." St. Basil says that Arius "presented this same profession of Faith to Alexander, deceiving him." He does not deny, he freely admits rather, that it was the ancient Creed of the Church; but he complains that the Arians put their own interpretation on it. "And having," he says, "set down the profession of Faith, he at once passes on to his interpretations; for this reason among others, that the profession in question is not enough to do away with the charges under which he lies. . . . Tell me, this pious tradition of the Fathers, and, as you yourself have termed it, this rule and gnomon and safe criterion, is it now, on the contrary, proclaimed to be an instrument of deceit and a means of deceiving?"[6] Elsewhere,

[5] *Adv. Eunom.*, l. 1, n. 4.

[6] *Ib.*, n. 5. "For the Old Roman Creed, as any one may easily convince himself, is neutral with regard to the opposition between orthodoxy and Arianism. An Arian can perfectly well recite it, for he does not deny that Christ is the only Son of God, but, on the contrary, maintains it, together with all the other statements which are combined in the Creed."—*The Apostles' Creed*, by Dr. Adolf Harnack (translated from the German for *The Nineteenth Century*, July, 1893, by Mrs. Humphry Ward).

dealing with its use as a Baptismal Creed, he says: "Shall I, then, give over that tradition which brought me to the light, which gave me the knowledge of God, by which I became a child of God? . . . Nay, rather do I pray that it may be my good fortune to go hence to the Lord with this Confession (ὁμολογίας) on my lips."[7] Of this Baptismal Creed he says later on (c. 27; n. 65), "The very Confession of Faith in Father, Son and Holy Ghost, from what written records have we it?" Now, the Creed of the Council was a written Creed.

This same Confession of Faith, which he calls "the Faith" simply, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, a contemporary of St. Basil, presents to us in his discourses to catechumens. "The Faith" was not written by Cyril; it is not to be found, as Migne notes, in any of the MSS. of his works; he forbore putting it in writing, as did St. Augustine, conformably to the Discipline of the Secret. Still, it may be reconstructed from his writings, as it has been from those of St. Augustine. Migne (*i. e.* a writer cited by that editor) has picked out of his sermons and pieced together the Symbol of the Mother Church of Jerusalem, which is set forth in the following table, side by side with the Old Roman Symbol:

Old Roman Symbol.	Symbol of Jerusalem.
(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty;	(1) We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible;
(2) And in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord;	(2) And in one Lord Jesus Christ, only-begotten Son of God, born true God of the Father, before all ages; by whom all things were made;
(3) Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary;	(3) Who came in the flesh, and was made man of the Holy Virgin and the Holy Ghost [Cath. 4, a 9.];
(4) Crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried,	(4) Crucified and buried,
(5) Rose again the third day from the dead,	(5) Rose again the third day;
(6) Ascended into heaven.	(6) And ascended into heaven.
(7) Sitteth at the right hand of the Father,	(7) And sitteth at the right hand of the Father,

[7] *Liber de Spiritu Sancto*, c. 9; n. 26 (Migne, P. G., tom. 32).

Old Roman Symbol.	Symbol of Jerusalem.
(8) Whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.	(8) And is to come in glory to judge the quick and dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end.
(9) And in the Holy Ghost;	(9) And in one Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spoke by the prophets;
(10) The Holy Church,	(10) And in one holy Catholic Church;
(11) The remission of sins;	(11) And in one baptism of penance for the remission of sins;
(12) The resurrection of the flesh.	(12) And in the resurrection of the flesh, and the life everlasting.

Here, then, we have the Baptismal Creed of the Mother Church of Jerusalem. Immediately on finishing his exposition of it, St. Cyril says to his catechumens: "We have discoursed upon the holy and Apostolic Faith (Symbol) that has been delivered to you, and that you are to make profession of."[8] The fact that this Symbol was in use in the Church of Jerusalem in the fourth century serves to dissipate the doubt raised by Harnack, where he says: "But if the Cæsarean symbol is not one framed for a particular community, then we know absolutely nothing of any definite, detailed, ancient communal symbols in the East of any date preceding the Nicene Creed."[9] For here is a definite, detailed, ancient Eastern Symbol, "communal, such as the Roman," for the Church of Jerusalem formed the nucleus of a great religious community in the East, as the Church of Rome did in the West; and demonstrably older than the Nicene Creed. It bespeaks an earlier stage of development than that Creed, as any one may see who will be at the pains to compare the two; it wants several of the additions made at Nice, notably the ὁμουσιον τῷ πατρί; it is the simpler formulary, and therefore the older. Besides, how comes it to have been still the Baptismal Creed of Jerusalem in St. Cyril's day, after the promulgation of the Nicene decrees, but that it already was in possession there time out of mind, and so could claim exemption, even as did the Old Roman Creed, on the score of its Apostolic origin?

But what is the relationship of St. Cyril's Creed to the Old Roman Symbol? Harnack finds it to be "so close that Cyril's

[8] *Cat.* 17, 32.

[9] *The Apostles' Creed* (translated from the German by the Rev. Stewart Means), p. 43.

Symbol can only be the daughter or the sister of the Roman one."[10] The sister it cannot well be: it bears about it the tokens of too ripe a growth for that. Therefore, Harnack concludes that it must be the daughter. Unfortunately for this conclusion, his disjunctive is not complete. Cyril's Symbol may stand in the relation of a sister's daughter to the Roman one. And this, as will now be shown, is just the relationship. Harnack's guess as to the Roman origin of St. Cyril's Creed rests on the assumption that there was no Baptismal Creed in the East before the Council of Nice promulgated its Creed—an assumption that has not the faintest shadow of warrant in fact. As well might he maintain that the Mother Church of Jerusalem got her Faith and Baptism from Rome as that she got her Symbol thence. And here let me say, with all the deference that is due to Harnack's undoubted scholarship, that when he commits himself to the statement that "there was no established baptismal confession of faith in the East in the third century," he does but declare his own unfitness to give expert testimony on the question that is under discussion. There never yet has been a Church within the pale of Christ's world-wide Kingdom but has had some fixed Baptismal Confession of Faith. "The Faith" in which St. Cyril baptized his catechumens, was not, he tells them expressly, the Faith of the East alone, or of the West alone, but of the Catholic Church—the Church of all ages and of all lands, the same in Jerusalem as in Rome, the same in the first century as in the fourth. "The Catholic Church," he says, "teaches you in the Confession of Faith to believe in one Holy Spirit."[11] But since "baptism bestows the Rule of Truth," or Confession of Faith, which Irenæus tells us it did even in the second century, then as surely as there was baptism in the East before the Council of Nice, so surely was there in the East a fixed Baptismal Creed.

Stripped of its additions (all of them of a strongly marked Eastern character), Cyril's Creed is the primitive Creed of the Church; the ancient Confession in which Athanasius, or rather Vigilius, finds the "so great glory of the Most Holy Trinity set forth in twelve distinct phrases;" the "gnomon and rule and safe

[10] *Ib.*, p. 47.
[11] *Catech.* 17, n. 3.

criterion," based upon the Baptismal Formula, to which Eunomius and the other Arians of his day appeal as to "the common Faith of all who wish to appear or to be Christians;" the Creed, in fine, which Marcellus of Ancyra brought with him from the East and presented to Pope Julius, some time between 337 and 341 A.D., as the Confession learned "from my [his] forefathers in God." It is true that Marcellus says he learned it also from the Scriptures; but so say many of the Fathers, among them some who say in the same breath that it was composed by the Apostles.[12] They mean, of course, as Marcellus meant, that they found in the Scriptures every truth set forth in the Creed. There is one thing, however, that Marcellus does not say: he does not say that he learned his Creed in Rome. And yet the critics, in the very teeth of what he does say, namely, that he got his Creed from his "forefathers in God" (who were not Romans), tell us that the Creed of Marcellus is the Old Roman Creed. In this the critics are true to their method, but false to fact, or rather what they take to be the fact. If the Old Roman Creed was drawn up at Rome some time between 100 and 150 A.D., as certain of the critics believe, then the Creed of Marcellus is emphatically not the Old Roman Creed. If, on the other hand, the Old Roman Creed is what Hilary and Ambrose and Jerome and Leo and Rufinus say it is—the Symbol of Faith composed by the Twelve before their separation—the Creed of Marcellus, with "Father" added to its first article, and "life everlasting" dropped from the twelfth, is the Old Roman or Apostles' Creed.

The fatal mistake made by the critics in dealing with the Creed of Marcellus is to have judged of it by the later polemical formularies which sprang up like mushrooms in the East after the rise of the Arian heresy.[13] The Creed of Marcellus is older than any of these formularies, is not a polemical Creed, and was not a

[12] *Cf.* Cassianus, *De Incarnat.*, l. 6, c. 3. (Migne, P. L., tom. 50); St. Cyril, *Catech.* 5; 12 compared with *Catech.* 17; 32.

[13] "Sprang up like mushrooms" is a strong expression, but will hardly appear exaggerated in view of what St. Hilary, a contemporary witness, tells us in *Ad Constantium.* "For we bear witness one to another," he writes, "how that, ever since the Synod was convened at Nice, there is nothing but creed-writing . Yearly and monthly Creeds (faiths) are issued, those issued set aside, those set aside defended, the defenders anathematized, . . ." (*Ib.*, lib. 2, n. 5.)

written Creed till he put it in writing for the first time. Marcellus himself was one of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers who gave to the world the Nicene Symbol, and was distinguished at the Council for his championship of the Orthodox Faith. The Creed that he got from his "forefathers in God" existed in the East, therefore, long before Arius was born.

Let me cite, in further proof of this, one or two passages from the writings of so competent a witness as St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers. Hilary knew the East thoroughly in the first half of the fourth century, having striven earnestly there with the Arians, on their own ground, for "the Faith once delivered to the Saints." An exile in the East, he writes to the Emperor Constantius. Here is the context of the passage just given in a footnote:

"Recognize, excellent and most pious Emperor, the Creed which you formerly desired to hear from the (Arian) Bishops, and did not. For when it was sought from them, they wrote out their own creeds, and taught not the things of God. They have carried their error round the everlasting globe, and with it a strife that ever returns upon itself. Man in his feebleness ought to have been modest, and to have kept the sacrament (mystery, symbol) of the knowledge of God in his conscience within those terms wherein he (first) made an act of faith. It behooved him not, after confessing under oath in baptism the Faith *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, to doubt aught, or innovate aught. But through presumption, or complaisance, or error, some have deceitfully confessed the unchangeable ordinance[14] of the Apostolic doctrine; others have boldly gone beyond it; while the true, natural meaning of the Confession in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is evaded, lest that meaning should remain which ought to be confessed in the sacrament of regeneration. . . . *Ib.*, n. 4.

"A Creed, then, is sought, as if there were no Creed. The Creed must be written, as if it were not in the heart. Born again by faith, now we are taught unto Faith, as if that second birth were without Faith. We learn Christ after baptism, as if there could be any baptism without the Faith of Christ. . . . As it is the safest course for those who sail the stormy sea in winter, when shipwreck threatens, to return to the port whence they set sail; and as it behooves inexperienced young men, who have gone beyond the bounds observed by their father, and, in keeping up the home, have spent their patrimony with too prodigal a hand,

[14] "Constitutionem" may properly be rendered "rule" or "symbol."

now, for fear of losing their all, to go back to the way of their father, as the needful and only safe way; so, amid such shipwreck of the Faith as we see around us, when the heritage of our heavenly patrimony is all but squandered, the safest course for us is to hold fast the first and only Evangelical Creed, learned and confessed in baptism. . . . This I have so believed in the Holy Spirit that I cannot now be taught any Faith beyond it concerning the Lord Jesus Christ: not thereby dissenting from the Faith of the Fathers (Nicene Creed), but following the Symbol of my second birth, and the knowledge of evangelical doctrine, which are in no wise at variance with that (Creed)."—*Ib.*, n. 6–11.

Thus does Hilary, writing to Constantius, take for granted, as something known to all, the existence, in the East, too, of a Baptismal Creed based upon the Trinitarian Formula; of a Creed which antedated all written Creeds, including the Nicene. He calls it "the first and only Evangelical Creed, learned and confessed in baptism," the "Apostolic Faith" (n. 6), *i. e.*, Symbol, and sets forth as its content (n. 11), approved also by Scripture, as many as seven articles of the Old Roman Creed. In short, he makes it plain that he is referring to what has been ever known in the Church as the Symbol of the Apostles. He counsels to Christians in the East, under the Emperor Constantius, a return to this the Creed of their baptism. Perhaps those who say that "there was no established baptismal confession of faith in the East in the third century," will tell us how there can be a return to that which never existed.

Upheld by St. Hilary, and borne, as it were, upon his shoulders, we can see far into the third century, and descry in the East the object of our quest—a counterpart and *alter ego* of the Old Roman Symbol. But there is yet another passage in the writings of St. Hilary which must be cited. It is found in the *Liber de Synodis, seu de Fide Orientalium.* We learn from it that while the Creed was never written in the West in Hilary's time, polemical formularies, written Creeds based upon the Symbol, began to be published in the East owing to the spread of heresy. He is addressing his brother Bishops in Germany and other parts of the West:

"But blessed are ye in the Lord and full of glory, who hold fast, in the confession of the conscience, the perfect and Apostolic Creed, and as yet know nothing of written creeds. For you stand not in need of the letter, abounding as you do in the spirit. Nor

do you want the help of a hand to write what you believe with the heart, and confess with the lips unto salvation. Neither was it needful for you to read out to a bishop what you held (in memory) when you stood at the baptismal font. But necessity has introduced the custom of setting forth creeds in writing and subscribing to them. For where the inmost sentiment of the mind is in question, there the letter is required. And certainly there is no bar to the writing of that which it is salutary to confess."—*Ib.*, n. 63. Later on, however (n. 84), he deems it needful to offer this justification of his having reproduced in writing the Nicene Creed: "And the Symbol itself which was at that time piously put in writing, it will not be impious in us to have inserted in this our work."

From these passages we gather that the Baptismal Creed, which Hilary plainly implies to have been the same in the East as in the West, and which he speaks of as an "unchangeable ordinance" or "rule" of Apostolic doctrine, was not at all a written Creed, and is not to be confounded with any of the numerous polemical confessions called forth by the Arian controversy. These, indeed, were built on the foundation of the unwritten Creed, but so fashioned as the exigencies of each case required. Hence we find the second article, about which the main controversy raged, to be abnormally developed in most of these formularies, while the third is often rudimentary.[15] To Hilary it appeared as if, amid this multiplicity of creeds, Faith in the East had parted from her old moorings, and, tossed about on an angry sea of controversy, could escape shipwreck only by a return to the safe anchorage of her ancient Symbol.

We have traced this Symbol in the East, through Basil, Hilary, and Marcellus, back to the third century. Both Hilary and Marcellus first saw the light towards the close of that century, and "the forefathers in God," from whom the latter got the Symbol, belong to an earlier period. Among them we may reckon Origen and Clement of Alexandria. Here are the elements of what Origen calls "the sure outline and plain rule of Apostolic teaching," as given in *Of Beginnings*, bk. 1, n. 4.

(1) "There is one God who created and ordered all things"; (2)

[15] Writers on this subject usually refer to the ninth article with those that follow as the "third" because it introduces the last of the three main divisions of the Symbol.

"this God . . . sent our Lord Jesus Christ," (3) "who . . . took a body, . . . born of the Virgin and the Holy Ghost"; (4) "suffered truly, . . . truly died"; (5) "truly rose from the dead"; (6) "and after His resurrection . . . was taken up." (9) "Then . . . they have handed down (the belief in) the Holy Ghost." (12) "After this, that the soul, . . . when it quits this world, will be dealt with according to its deserts; will possess the heritage of eternal life, or be banished into everlasting fire; . . . but also that a time will come when the dead shall rise again."[16]

The numerals point to the corresponding articles of the Old Roman Creed. It will be noticed that mention is made of the Holy Ghost in the article on the Virgin Birth—an uncommon thing in the written creeds of the century that followed. Who can doubt that we have here the Apostolic Symbol, so far as the Discipline of the Secret admitted of its being given in writing? Origen tells us that it was "handed down from the Apostles through successive generations," and that "that alone is to be received as true which in no wise disagrees with the ecclesiastical and Apostolic Tradition."—*Ib.*, n. 2.

About the middle of the third century, shortly before the death of Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, writing to Dionysius of Rome, who afterwards became Pope, tells him that Novatian has strayed so far from the truth as to "overturn the Confession of Faith (πίστιν και ὁμολογίαν) which precedes baptism."[17] Here is further evidence, not inferential, but direct and categorical, of the existence in the East, in the third century, of what Harnack has so egregiously failed to find there, "an established baptismal confession of Faith." Dionysius makes no manner of doubt that his Roman namesake will know what truths are embodied in the Baptismal Creed which he does but mention merely; the same Faith and the same Baptism would involve the use of the same Symbol within the pale of the same Catholic and Apostolic Church. It is this Symbol of the Church of Alexandria that Origen summarizes for us in the passage cited above. He got it when a boy from St. Clement, Bishop of that Church; for Eusebius tells us that Origen attended the catechetical instruction given

[16] Migne, P. G., tom. 11.

[17] Eusebius *Hist.*, bk. 6, ch. 8.

by St. Clement.[18] We can picture to ourselves the precocious boy eagerly drinking in those words of the venerable old Bishop who had "been worthy to hear" men who "preserved the true tradition of the blessed doctrine, directly from Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, the holy Apostles, having received it in succession, the son from the father, though few resemble their fathers."[19] "Follow God," St. Clement exhorted his hearers, " . . . holding fast what is thine, what is good, what cannot be taken from thee, the Faith in God, the Confession in Him who suffered."[20] This he calls "a most precious possession," and well he may, for it is no other than that pearl of great price, the Symbol of the Apostles, which sums up in twelve articulate words "the Faith once for all delivered to the saints." In a later chapter (l. 6, c. 10) he defines it for us as "the knowledge, in a brief and compendious form, of those things that are necessary to be known."

It may be well, before going further, to cast a side-glance at the futile attempt of Kattenbusch and Harnack to free their theory from straits. The difficulty which they had to find some way out of was this. If the Symbol originated in Rome in the second century, how came it to be the Baptismal Creed of the Eastern Church in the fourth? When and where did it gain official entrance into the East? The failure of the two German writers to answer this question satisfactorily is conspicuous and complete. Both of them seem to regard "the period of struggles with Paul of Samosata" (*The Apostles' Creed*, p. 49) as a likely one for their attempt at smuggling the Old Roman Creed into the the Orient. But we have given chapter and verse of Eusebius to show that, during this very period, the East had its Rule of Faith, and that the Church of Alexandria was in peaceful possession of her Baptismal Creed some years before the heresiarch of Samosata was deposed from the See of Antioch. We say "some years," so as to be strictly within the letter of our historical warrant.

[18] *Ib.*, ch. 6.

[19] Clem. *Stromata*, bk. 1.

[20] "τηνεὶς τον θεον πίστιν, τηνεὶς τον παθοντα ὁμολογίαν." *Paed.* l. 2; c. 3. "Eusebius and the Nicene Council," the observant Pearson notes (vol. 2; p. 14) "have παθοντα only in their Creeds."

Now, Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen and Clement got their Symbol or Baptismal Creed in the East, where they were "born again" unto God in baptism. For baptism, as Irenæus tell us, "bestows the Rule of Truth," which is no other than the Baptismal Creed. This is "the true tradition of the blessed doctrine" which came down from the Apostles, the son receiving it from his father in God and Christ. And as all succession in Christ from father to son had its source in the East, it follows that the Baptismal Creed, handed down in the direct line of that succession, had in the East its origin. Baptized in the East within about a half century of the passing of St. John, Irenæus got the Creed there with his baptism. He brought it with him to the West, too, whither it had been brought long before his day. And he assures us that the Church of the second century, various as were the languages in which she spoke, professed her Baptismal Faith, wherever in all the world she begot children to God, in terms of one and the same Apostolic Rule of Truth.

Of this same Symbol we find clear traces—more we may not look for—in the writings of Justin and Ignatius, the disciple of St. John. "As many as are persuaded and believe," writes the former, "that the things we teach and declare are true, and give assurance that they are able to live accordingly, . . . are then led by us where there is water, and are regenerated after the manner of regeneration whereby we also are regenerated."[21] The reference to the catechetical instruction and profession of faith which precede baptism is explicit, and the renunciation of Satan, his works, and his pomps, is clearly implied. St. Justin adds that "they are then washed in that water, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost;" and later on varies the mention of the Second Person, saying "in the name of Jesus Christ crucified under Pontius Pilate," where the addition "under Pontius Pilate" carries the mind back to the profession of faith in the words of the Symbol, which preceded baptism. He had already (n. 31) given, from the prophetical books of the Old Testament, a summary of what critics call "christological attributes," which plain people are famil-

[21] *Apol.* 1, n. 61 (Migne, P. G., tom. 6). *Cf.* also *Ib.*, nn. 21, 42, 46; *Dial.* 85, 132.

iar with as that part of the Creed that concerns the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.

In St. Ignatius' *Ad Trallianos* the early use of the Symbol in its recommendatory character, as a test of Church membership, is not obscurely hinted at. The passage runs (the numbers once more refer to the articles of the Old Roman Creed):

"Close, then, your ears to any one who speaks to you apart from (2) Jesus Christ, who was of the race of David; (3) who was of Mary, who was truly born, ate and drank; (4) truly suffered persecution under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died, in the sight of those who are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; (5) who also truly arose again from the dead, His Father having raised Him; (12) as, His Father will raise in Jesus Christ, without whom we have no true life, after the likeness of Him, us also who in Him believe."—*Ib.*, c. 9. *Cf.* also *Ad Smyr.*, c. 1, where with other elements of the Symbol, "one body of His Church," is included.

The Church in the East, from the fifth century upward, witnesses, with the Church in the West, to the Apostolic authorship of the Symbol. Some of the Eastern Fathers give no more than an implicit declaration of their mind in the matter, as St. John Chrysostom, when he says: "Hence it is plain that they (the Apostles) did not deliver everything in writing, but much also without writing; and this too is worthy of belief. Wherefore, we account also the tradition of the Church worthy of belief. It is the tradition: seek nothing further."[22] We have also explicit testimony. St. John Cassian, disciple and deacon of St. Chrysostom, bears witness that the Symbol "was put together by the Apostles of the Lord." (*De Incarn. Christi*, l. 6; c. 3.) "I have delivered to you the Apostolic Faith," writes St. Athanasius to Serapion, "as it has been handed down to us by the Fathers."[23] Elsewhere (*Lib. de Sp. Sanct.*, c. 27, Migne, P. G., tom. 32) the same Saint enumerates the "Confession of Faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," among "the teachings transmitted in a secret manner from the tradition of the Apostles." "May we, to the last breath of life," writes St. Gregory Nazianzen, "confess with great confidence that excellent Deposit of the holy fathers who

[22] *Hom. in Ep. 2 ad Thessal.*, c. 2—Hom. IV (Migne, P. G., tom. 62).

[23] *Ep. ad Serap.*, n. 33 (Migne, P. G., tom. 26).

were nearest to Christ; that Confession of the primitive Faith which has been familiar to us from childhood, which we first uttered and with which may we depart this life bearing godliness with us hence, this, if nothing else."[24] Again, he refers to the Symbol as "that excellent Deposit which we received from our fathers; adoring the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost . . . in whose name we have been cleansed in the waters of baptism."[25] St. Epiphanius testifies that the Church "received the Faith (Symbol) as a sacred trust from the Apostles;" and, having cited the Nicene Symbol, with the addition of the articles omitted by the Council, adds: "This Formula of Faith was handed down to us from the holy Apostles, and prescribed in the holy city by all the Bishops; in number, three hundred and eighteen."[26] Here Epiphanius speaks by the book, for the Fathers of Nice did not draw up the Symbol—that was the work of the Apostles. They did but define the meaning of it more clearly, and reaffirm, with all the authority vested in them, the truths which it embodied. Finally, the two hundred Bishops assembled at Ephesus in 431, in their *Relation* to the Emperor Theodosius, speak of "the Faith (*i. e.* Symbol), originally delivered (to the Church) by the Apostles, and afterwards expounded by three hundred and eighteen Fathers in the metropolitan city of Nice."[27] The testimony of Irenæus to the existence in the East as well as in the West, in his day, of a Baptismal Creed and Rule of Truth handed down from the Apostles, has been cited in a preceding article.

At page 4 of a now oft-cited work, Harnack tells his readers that "the Eastern Church has at no time traced any creed to an Apostolic origin, or designated any as Apostolic in the strict sense of the word." The evidence that has been now brought forward in disproof will make it needful for Harnack to buttress his assertion with some more substantial prop than the declaration

[24] Καὶ ὁμολογοίημεν μέχρι τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀνανοῆς ἐν πολλῇ παῤῥησίᾳ τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, τῶν ἐγγυτέρω Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῆς πρώτης πίστεως τὴν συντροφον ημῖν ἐκ παίδων ὁμολογίαν, ἣν πρώτην ἐφθεγξάμεθα, καὶ ᾗ τελευταῖον συναπέλθοιμεν, τοῦτο, εἰ μή τι ἄλλο, ενθτεῦθεν ἀποφερόμενοι τὴν εὐσέβειαν. —*Orat.* 11, alias 6 (Migne, P. G., tom. 35, col. 832).

[25] *Orat.* 6, n. 22 (Migne, P. G., tom. 35).

[26] *Ancoratus*, 118 (Migne, P. G., tom. 43).

[27] Bollandist's *Acta Sanctorum*, die 15 Julii.

of a Greek Archbishop at Florence some fourteen hundred years after Paul preached the risen Christ to the men of Athens.[28]

We have traced the Symbol back to the Apostolic Age, following our quest in the East as in the West, along a trail of light, in the path of the ancient tradition. It remains to point out vestiges of it in the New Testament and decipher the allusions to it which are to be found in that inspired record.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D., V.G.

St. Francis Xavier's College,
Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

A PLEA FOR CERTITUDE IN PHILOSOPHY.

Suggested by "A Plea for Catholic Agnosticism." [1]

IN my younger days I loved to speculate at random, but, as I grew older, the fascination of independent thought became less, because I found that the goal of my dreaming, like the will-o'-the-wisp, ever receded further from me. And how could it be otherwise? I had no fixed starting-point, as I have since learned one must have (and can have only) in the recognition of self-evident truths. Had I not found this out, I should have in all probability, like the college professors under whom I first sat, explored many fields, and ended by finding all of them unsatisfactory.

My readers will no doubt infer that I, unlike the versatile writer of "A Plea for Catholic Agnosticism" in the April number of this magazine, was not at first educated in the scholastic system of which he complains. Mine was "the men for the system," not "the system for the men," philosophy, to quote his classification. The mental reaction which to-day leads me to advocate the latter, and discard the former system, will perhaps be ascribed by some

[28] Harnack's authority is cited in a footnote, as follows: "*Cf.* the testimony of Archbishop Marcus Eugenicus at the Council of Florence, in 1438, as given by Sylvester Sguropolis, Hist. Council. Florent., sect. 6, c. 6, p. 150, edit. Rob. Creyghton, 1660." The testimony of a fifteenth century witness is accepted; the testimony of fourth century witnesses, of Basil, and Gregory, and Epiphanius, is ignored. Great is historical criticism, and great are its prerogatives.

[1] April number, pp. 394–407.

to the forced, quasi-dogmatic training which I may afterwards have received in philosophy, under the guidance of some ultra-conservative seminary professor. Whether or not this is the chief or exclusive reason for my present preference, the reader can best judge when he has read what I have to say.

As the title of the present article indicates, I claim that there is a possibility of arriving at certitude in philosophy. By this statement I wish to be understood as meaning simply that natural or rational certitude is just as attainable in intellectual science as it is in the other abstract or physical sciences, such, for instance, as astronomy. If, for example, we make strictly logical deductions from the self-evident truths, they are certainly true. Furthermore, it is clear that certitude admits of degrees, according to the order of the premises from which it is logically derived. There are in this science conclusions which are more or less probable, according to the probability of the *data* from which they are logically derived. This, so far as I am aware, constitutes the only "cocksureness" which the advocates of the scholastic philosophy have ever claimed.

The contention between the scholastics and their opponents must, in the last analysis, therefore, be reduced to one question: Are there self-evident truths? If not, it would be useless for us to think about, or compare systems of philosophy. But none of us really acts on the hypothesis of their denial. As Wilfrid Ward puts it, "We eat and walk and converse with our neighbors, we kick stones with Dr. Johnson, without being disturbed by the sceptical idealists." We cannot argue or reason with any one who doubts, or requires a demonstration of truths which are self-evident.

I am well aware that a philosophy based on these principles, and rigidly expressed in dialectic form, affords to the minds of those who are ever seeking new things but little gratification. I am ready to admit that its conclusions are reached without the excitement of discovery; they are the old, plain, and worn-out truisms which have been dinned into our ears ever since we listened to and obeyed our teachers and superiors; nay, more, we accepted them before we ever heard of logic or metaphysics. Is it any wonder, then, that in this age of progress and discovery, restless

and youthful investigators who have sapiently explored the phenomena of matter, impatiently cry out, "Must we theologians always keep in the old peripatetic paths of the schoolmen? Can we not get some new starting-point, and discover new and hidden secrets in the spiritual realm?" We might, perhaps, if the mind were not designed by the Creator to be the organ of truth, if intellectual error did not endanger our faith, if acceptance of Divine teaching did not enter into the awful probation upon which salvation depends. We are always confronted with the terrible alternative: "*Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia est ut teneat catholicam fidem.*" Can it be that some of us would be rash enough to try to ride two horses going in opposite directions at the same time? The questions discussed in the old system are, we are well aware, not those which receive due recognition from the modern secular mind; but long before the formularies of the faith were set forth, earnest, serious minds painfully groped through the dry processes of defining such ideas as *substantia*, *persona*, *accidens*, *materia*, *forma*, etc., and left such an intellectual inheritance to those who afterwards received the light of revelation, that their very terms are enshrined in the Creeds of the Church for all time. On this account these old philosophical distinctions must be understood by those who are divinely called to teach Christian doctrine, and are necessary to us, if we would make our message intelligible to the modern sceptic. Our fathers in the faith used the old philosophy as the handmaid of theology; by means of it they framed the unchangeable dogmas of the Church. Can it be that some of us would like to preserve the divine superstructure after destroying the natural foundation upon which it is built? This, in my opinion, is what the "Catholic Agnostic" is trying to do.

If each one had for himself a philosophy constructed on a different foundation from that of every other, could the claims of a common faith be more easily presented to the unbelieving world than they are at present? This is the practical question which our ecclesiastical educators have to answer when they are advised to discard the traditional philosophy.

How are we getting on, as it is, in the work of extending the faith? Is there any body of religious teachers in the world that

exerts an intellectual influence on men comparable to that of the Catholic clergy? Yet all of them have been trained in the scholastic philosophy. The results of this training, moreover, are not to be measured by the work of to-day, but by the triumphs of centuries. Other leaders of thought have held sway for a decade or generation, only to be superseded by those who could better satisfy the vanity of their disciples. The Catholic Church has stood at the head of every great intellectual movement which has elevated mankind. Naturally speaking, this is due to the fact that her children most earnestly seek to know scientific truth scientifically, and to profit by it practically. And her system of education, which has been developed by the accumulated wisdom of ages, is, I think, in no danger of being set aside.

HENRY H. WYMAN, C.S.P.

San Francisco, California.

VOTIVE MASSES.

PART II.

PRIVILEGED.

1.—There are some votive Masses, which, though they cannot be called in a strict sense *solemn*, are considered such in a certain sense, because they partake in a greater or less degree of the privileges of *solemn* votive Masses. They are called *privileged.* They are:

A. The Mass of a Transferred Feast;[1]

B. The Masses of the feasts of *Corpus Christi* and SS. Peter and Paul, the solemnization of which is transferred to the following Sunday;

C. The Solemnization of Titulars of Churches on the Sunday following the feast, *by special Indult;*

D. The Masses which are celebrated during Forty Hours' Devotion;

E. The Mass of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of each month;

[1] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. vi.

F. The Mass of the Consecration of a Church or an Altar;

G. The Mass on the anniversary of the Election and Consecration of a Bishop;

H. The Nuptial Mass;

I. The Masses celebrated by priests having defective sight.

A.—Mass of a Transferred Feast.

2.—When the feast of the Titular of a Church, or other feast at which it is customary to have an *extraordinary*[2] concourse of people cannot be celebrated on the festival day on account of the occurrence of a greater feast, it is permitted to celebrate *one* solemn votive Mass of the Titular on the festival day in such church, but all the other Masses must be celebrated according to the rubrics of the *Ordo*.[3]

3.—This Mass is prohibited on:

1°. Sundays, *1ae classis:* I. Advent, I. Lent, Passion, Palm, *in Albis*, Trinity;

2°. Feasts, *Dupl. 1ae classis:* Christmas, Epiphany, Easter Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, Ascension, Pentecost Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, *Corpus Christi;*

3°. Ash-Wednesday and during Holy Week.[4]

Note.—On these days (**3**, 1°, 2°, 3°), the Mass of the day is celebrated, and not even a *commemoration* of the transferred feast is made.[5]

4.—This solemn votive Mass will be celebrated with *Gloria*, only *one* oration, *Credo* and Gospel of St. John at the end of the Mass, according to the rules of the *solemn* votive Masses.[6]

[2] S.R.C., Sept. 23, 1837, n. 2769, ad viii, 4.

[3] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. vi. This Mass may be celebrated even in churches in which the conventual Mass is not of obligation. S.R.C., Aug. 17, 1709, n. 2198, ad 1.

[4] S.R.C., Dec. 11, 1897. *Urbis et Orbis. Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. vi. novissime reform.* Since other feasts *dupl. Iae classis*, whether universal or local, are not excluded by this rubric, this solemn votive Mass can be celebrated on them, except the Sundays on which *Corpus Christi* and the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul are solemnized. S.R.C., March 12, 1836, n. 2738.

[5] S.R.C., April 16, 1853, n. 3009, ad 2.

[6] See The Ecclesiastical Review, April, 1903, p. 388, No. 7, 1°, 2°, 4° and p. 389, 7, 8°.

B.—Feasts of Corpus Christi and SS. Peter and Paul.

5.—By an Indult of Card. Caprara, Legate *a latere* of Pius VII, at Paris, dated April 9, 1802, permission was granted to all the churches of the French Dominion to solemnize the following feasts on the Sunday after the feast-days, if they occurred during the week: Epiphany, *Corpus Christi*, SS. Peter and Paul and the principal patrons of the place,[7] but not the Titulars of churches. Some feasts of obligation were to be suppressed, and the four mentioned above were selected. The object of the solemnization of these feasts on the following Sunday was to maintain the veneration of the people for them. Permission to solemnize the feast of SS. Peter and Paul in this manner was granted to the United States, Dec. 19, 1840,[8] and of the feast of *Corpus Christi*, Nov. 25, 1885.[9]

6.—The solemnization of these feasts consists in this that only *one* solemn high Mass or a *missa cantata* of the feast is celebrated on the Sunday following the Feast. This Mass will be with *Gloria*, *Credo*, proper Preface, *Ite Missa est* and Gospel of St. John. It has only *one* oration, except in churches in which the Conventual Mass is not of obligation, for then the oration of the Sunday is added *sub distincta conclusione* and its Gospel is read at the end instead of the Gospel of St. John.[10] If, however, the feast of SS. Peter and Paul falls on a Sunday, its solemnization is not transferred to the following Sunday, but on the feast itself the Mass is celebrated *more festivo*.[11]

C.—Titulars of Churches.

7.—The Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore[12] desired that the Titulars of churches in rural districts be solemnized on the Sunday next following the feast. Rubricists consider this solemnization to consist in a solemn votive Mass of the feast.[13]

[7] *Civitatis* aut *oppidi*, etc., atque etiam, in illius tantum defectu, *Patroni Dioecesis*. S.R.C., Dec. 2, 1891, n. 3754, I.

[8] *Concilium Plen. Baltimor.*, III, p. cix. [9] *Ibidem.*

[10] S.R.C., Dec. 2, 1891, n. 3754, ii.

[11] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 276.

[12] *Conc. Balt.*, II, n. 384.

[13] Gabriels, *Quaestiones Mechlinienses*, Quaest. 113.

The S. R. C. decreed, Febr. 22, 1902,[14] that this cannot be done "*nisi constet de expresso atque speciali Indulto Apostolico.*" By such special Indult the Holy See, Febr. 3, 1903, granted this privilege to all the churches, whether in cities or in rural districts, throughout the Untied States.[15] The Mass is celebrated in the manner given above, No. **6.**

8.—This Mass can be celebrated on any Sunday of the year except on:

1°. Sundays *1ae classis:* I. Advent, I. Lent, Passion, Palm, Easter, *in Albis,* Pentecost, and Trinity.[16]

2°. Vigil of Christmas, Feast of the Circumcision, January 1st, and Octave of Epiphany, January 13th.[17]

3°. *Festa altioris solemnitatis seu dignitatis.*[18]

9.—If the *feast* falls on a Sunday *1ae classis* (except Palm Sunday) the Mass of the Sunday is celebrated and a commemoration of the feast is added to the oration of the Mass of the Sunday *sub una conclusione,* and no more attention is paid to its solemnization. If it falls on Palm Sunday, or on any of the more solemn feasts of the universal Church, the commemoration of it is not made, nor is its solemnity transferred.[19]

10.—If the *solemnization* falls on a Sunday *1ae classis,* on the *vigil* of Christmas, on the feast of the Circumcision, or on octave of Epiphany (January 13th), the Mass of such Sundays or feasts is celebrated and the solemnity is transferred to the *first free* Sunday.[20]

If the *solemnization* falls on a Sunday on which a feast *dupl. 1ae classis* occurs, then if the feast is of a greater dignity than the solemnity, or if both are of equal dignity, the feast will be celebrated and the solemnity is transferred to the *first free* Sunday. If the feast which is to be solemnized is of a greater dignity than the feast which occurs, then the solemnization takes place.[21] If two solemnizations fall on the same Sunday the less worthy is

[14] See THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1902, p. 190.
[15] See THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April, 1903, p. 457.
[16] S.R.C., Dec. 2, 1891, n. 3753, IV.
[17] *Ibidem.*
[18] *Ibidem.*
[19] *Ibidem* iii.
[20] *Ibidem* iv.
[21] *Ibidem* v.

transferred to the *first free* Sunday.[22] Hence if the solemnization of the Visitation of the B. V. Mary (*duplex II cl.*) and that of SS. Peter and Paul fall on the same Sunday, *e. g.* July 5th, the feast of the Apostles will be solemnized on this day and the feast of the Visitation will be solemnized July 12th.

Note I.—The solemnization of a feast must be celebrated on the *first free* Sunday following the festival day, although the feast had to be transferred to a day after such Sunday.

Example.—St. George is the Titular of the Church and his feast day, April 23d, falls on Easter Tuesday. In this case the feast will be transferred to May 11th. The solemnity ought to take place on Sunday, April 28th, but that day is Sunday *in Albis*, one of the prohibited Sundays,[23] hence it must be transferred to Sunday, May 5th, *i. e. Dom. II. post Pascha*, although the feast is transferred to May 11th.

Note II.—The solemnization cannot be anticipated on the Sunday before the feast without a special indult.[24]

D.—Forty Hours' Devotion.

11.—The Mass for the *Exposition* and for the *Reposition* of the Blessed Sacrament is the solemn votive Mass *de SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento*,[25] which is found among the votive Masses at the end of the Missal. It is celebrated with *Gloria*, *Credo*, Preface *de Nativitate*, and the Gospel of St. John.[26] During the octave of *Corpus Christi* the Mass will be *de Octava* with the *Sequentia*.[27] All commemorations and Collects are omitted.[28] The color of the vestments is *white*.

12.—On the second day of the Devotion the Mass is the solemn votive *pro Pace vel alia necessitate*, *arbitrio Episcopi*,[29]

[22] *Ibidem* vi; S.R.C., March 6, 1896, n. 3890, ad iii.

[23] *Vide supra* 8, 1°.

[24] *Nouv. Revue Theol.*, tom. xviii, p. 596; Pourbaix—Coppin, *S. Lit. Comp.*, Quaest. 304.

[25] Instructio Clement. XII.

[26] Even on Sundays, not only in Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, but in those also in which the conventual Mass is *not* of obligation. Martinucci, *Manuale SS. Caerem.*, lib. II, C. xxxviii, 107.

[27] S.R.C., May 18, 1883, n. 3574, ad v.

[28] *Ibidem.*

[29] S.R.C., May 23, 1835, n. 2723; May 9, 1857, n. 3049, ad iv.

and is celebrated without *Gloria* and (except on Sundays) without *Credo*, with the commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament *sub unica conclusione*, Preface communis (on Sundays *de Trinitate*) unless *ratione temporis* or *octavae occurrentis*, another must be sung, *Benedicamus Domino* and the Gospel of St. John at the end. All other commemorations and collects are omitted.[30] This Mass should not be celebrated at the altar of the Exposition, nor at the altar at which the Communion is distributed.[31]

13.—These Masses are forbidden:

1°. On Sundays *1ae et 2ae classis;*

2°. On Feasts *1ae et 2ae. classis;*

3°. On Ash-Wednesday, and Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of Holy Week;[32]

4°. During the octaves of Easter, Pentecost and Epiphany;

5°. On the Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost;

6°. During the privileged octaves *propriae*[33] which, by *special indult*, exclude the celebration of feasts *1ea et 2ae classis*, either falling on or transferred to those days.[34] On these days the Mass of the current office is sung with the commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament on the first and third days, and *pro Pace* or *alia necessitate, arbitrio Episcopi* on the second day, *sub unica conclusione*. If a feast *1ae vel 2ae classis* occurs on a Sunday during the Forty Hours' Devotion, the commemoration of the Sunday is made *sub distincta conclusione*, and the Gospel of the Sunday is read at the end. All other commemorations and collects are omitted.[35] On all these days the *Gloria* and *Credo* are sung when prescribed by the rite of the Mass, and the Preface will be *de festo, de octavo, de feria* or *de Dominica*, according to the rubric of the day. The color of the vestments will correspond with the feast or office.

14. The *tonus solemnis* or *festivus* will be used in the chant of these Masses, but on Ash-Wednesday and during Holy Week

[30] S.R.C., May 18, 1883, n. 3574, ad v.

[31] S.R.C., May 9, 1857, n. 3049, ad iv.

[32] On the last three days of Holy Week the devotion of Forty Hours is strictly forbidden. S.R.C., May 18, 1883, n. 3574, ad v.

[33] *Ibidem.*

[34] Gardellini, Instr. Clement XII, ad xi.

[35] S.R.C., May 18, 1883, n. 3574, ad v.

the *tonus ferialis* will be used, and the *Oratio super populum* after the Post Communion is sung *sub distincta conclusione*.[36]

15. The Masses of Exposition, Reposition, and *pro Pace* must be solemn High Masses, or at least *Missae Cantatae*, in order to enjoy the privileges of solemn votive Masses. If *low* Masses are said, they must be of the current office, with the commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament, unless the rubrics permit votive Masses, and then it is proper that they be *de SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento.*

E.—Sacred Heart—First Friday of Each Month.

16.—By a decree *Urbis et Orbis* of June 28, 1889,[37] Leo XIII granted permission, if approved by the Ordinary,[38] to celebrate a solemn votive Mass in honor of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, provided a special devotion is held in its honor either *before*, *during*, or *after* the Mass.[39] The devotion must have some connection with the Mass.

17.—With regard to the Mass it must be observed:

1°. That it may be celebrated in any church or oratory—public or private;

2°. That only *one* Mass is allowed in each church or oratory;

3°. That it may be a solemn High Mass, *Missa Cantata*, or a *low* Mass;[40]

4°. It enjoys the *ritus Missae votivae solemnis pro re gravi* with *Gloria*, *Credo*, only *one* oration (all commemorations are omitted,)[41] and the Gospel of St. John at the end.

18.—This Mass is the *Miserebitur*, found in the Missal at the end of May in the *Proprium Missarum de Sanctis.* The preface is always *de Cruce.* Outside of the Paschal season the *Alleluia* at the end of the Introit, Offertory and Communion is omitted.[42]

[36] *Ibidem.*

[37] S.R.C., n. 3712.

[38] Probably to prevent prayers being recited which are unliturgical.

[39] A suitable devotion would be (1) Exposition; (2) some approved act of Consecration or Reparation, or the Litany of the Sacred Heart, approved June 27, 1898 (S.R.C., n. 3996); (3) *Tantum Ergo* and Benediction.

[40] S.R.C., May 20, 1892, n. 3773.

[41] S.R.C., May 20, 1890, n. 3731, ad i.

[42] S.R.C., February 12, 1892, n. 3764, ad x.

In some places the Mass *Egredimini*, found in the Missal at the end of May among the *Missae pro aliquibus locis*, is granted. In this Mass the preface *de Nativitate* is said from Trinity Sunday to Septuagesima, but from Septuagesima to Pentecost it is *de Cruce*.[43]

19.—It is permitted on the first Friday of every month except when on such days occur:

(*a*) Feasts *dupl. 1ae classis;*

(*b*) Feasts of Our Lord generally: as Circumcision, Passion,[44] Instruments of the Passion, Finding of the Cross, Transfiguration;

(*c*) Privileged Ferials;[45]

(*d*) Privileged Vigils;[46]

(*e*) During the privileged octaves, Epiphany, Easter, Pentecost, *Corpus Christi*.[47]

(*f*) Feast of All Souls, November 2d, on whichall the Masses must be *Requiems*.[48]

F.—Consecration of a Church or an Altar.

20.—After the consecration of a *Church* a solemn Mass must be celebrated by the Bishop who has consecrated it, or by another Bishop or priest, in the consecrated church. This Mass will be *Terribilis*, found in the *fourth* part of the Missal, entitled *In anniversario dedicationis Ecclesiae*, with *Gloria*, only *one*[49] oration—*Deus, qui invisibiliter*—found after this Mass. Those commemorations, however, which are never omitted, not even on *dupl. 1ae classis*—i. e., *Dominicae, Feriae majoris, diei Octavae, dierum infra Octavam privilegiatam*—if they occur, must be made.[50] *Credo*, Preface *de Octava*, if the consecration takes place within an octave which has a proper preface; *de Tempore*, if it occurs in a cycle which has a special preface; otherwise *de S. Trinitate* or

[43] Rubr. Special. Miss.

[44] If the Office of the Passion (*votivum per annum*) is recited, this Mass is not forbidden, because it is not a feast of our Lord.

[45] Good Friday is the only one on which it can possibly fall, and that is a *dupl. 1ae classis*.

[46] Can occur only on *one* such vigil—*i. e.*, Epiphany.

[47] S.R.C., Juue 28, 1889, n. 3712.

[48] S.R.C., May 10, 1895, n. 3855, ad ii.

[49] Pontificale Rom., Pars II, De Dedicatione Ecclesiae, *in fine*.

[50] S.R C., February 24, 1884, n. 3605, ad iii, ad 1.

communis, if it occurs on a Sunday or weekday respectively. It will never be the *proper* of the feast occurring on that day, unless it have an octave,[51] and the Gospel of St. John at the end.

21.—This Mass is forbidden—

1°. On the following Sundays: I. Advent, I. Lent, Passion, Palm, *in Albis*, and Trinity;

2°. On the following feasts: Christmas, Epiphany, Easter Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, Ascension, Pentecost Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, *Corpus Christi*.

3°. Ash-Wednesday and during the Holy Week.[52]

On these days the current Mass is celebrated, and a commemoration of the Dedication added *sub una conclusione*.[53]

22.—On the following days, in churches in which the Conventual Mass is *not* of obligation, the Mass of the Dedication—*Terribilis*—is celebrated, and a commemoration of the Feast celebrated on that day, or of the *Dominica*, *Feria Major*, *dies Octava*, or *dies infra Octavam privilegiatam*, is added to the oration of the Mass *sub una conclusione:*

1°. Sacred Heart, Circumcision;

2°. Immaculate Conception, Annunciation of the B. V. Mary, Assumption;

3°. Nativity of St. John the Baptist, St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul, All Saints;

4°. Octaves of Epiphany, of Easter from Wednesday to Saturday, of Pentecost from Wednesday to Saturday;

5°. Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost.[54]

23.—After the consecration of a *fixed Altar* a solemn Mass is celebrated on it.[55] The Mass will be *Terribilis*,[56] but a special oration, *Deus qui ex omni*, is said, found after the Mass *In anniversario dedicationis Ecclesiae*, and all commemorations and collects are omitted.[57]

[51] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. xii, 4.

[52] Rubr. Gen. Miss., Tit. vi.

[53] S.R.C., February 23, 1884, n. 3605, ad iii, 3.

[54] *Ephem. Lit.*, vol. i, pp. 546 et 603.

[55] If several were consecrated, on *one* of them.

[56] *Vide supra* No. **20**.

[57] S.R.C., February 24, 1884, n. 3506, ad iii, 1.

These same rules are to be observed with regard to the Mass celebrated after the consecration of one or more *portable Altars*,[58] but then a *low* Mass may be celebrated.

24.—After the *blessing* of a new church, public chapel or public oratory by a Bishop or a priest, with the permission of the Ordinary, a Mass, which may be a *solemn* High Mass, *missa cantata* or a *low*[59] Mass, is celebrated by him who performed the blessing or by another Bishop or priest. This Mass may be either (1) *de tempore occurrenti*, i. e. *de Dominica majori 1ae classis or de Feria privilegiata*, or (2) of the Mystery[60] or of the saint in whose honor the church has been blessed,[61] not of the saint whose feast is celebrated on that day.

25.—If the Mass of the Mystery or of the saint in whose honor it has been blessed is celebrated, the *ritus* will be *votiva solemnis pro re gravi*,[62] i. e. with *Gloria*, only *one* oration, *Credo*, Preface *proper* of the votive Mass, or, if it has no proper Preface, of the *Octave* or of the *Cycle*[63] within which it occurs; otherwise it will be the *communis*, unless it occurs on a Sunday, when it will be *de Trinitate*, and the *Communicantes* proper if it occurs within the Octave of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension or Pentecost, even if the Preface proper of these octaves is not said, which would happen if the votive Mass had its proper Preface, and the Gospel of St. John at the end.

26.—This votive Mass is forbidden:

1°. On feasts *dupl. 1ae classis;*

2°. On the following Sundays: I. Advent, I. Lent, Passion, Palm, *in Albis*, and Trinity;

3°. On the Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost;

4°. On Ash-Wednesday and during Holy Week.[64]

On these days the Mass of the current office must be celebrated and the commemoration of the votive Mass is added to the

[58] Pontificale Rom., Pars II.

[59] S.R.C., February 23, 1884, n. 3605, ad ii, 2.

[60] Van der Stappen, *De Rubr. Miss. Rom.*, Quaest. 299.

[61] S.R.C., February 23, 1884, n. 3605, II, ad 1.

[62] *Ibidem*, 2.

[63] Lent, Passiontide, Eastertide, etc.

[64] S.R.C., June 30, 1896, n. 3922, ad ii, 2.

oration of the day *sub una conclusione*.[65] This is also the case when the Mass *de tempore occurrenti*[66] is celebrated.

Note.—The Mass *de communi pro dedicatione*, i. e., the Mass *Terribilis*, cannot be celebrated on this occasion. This Mass is restricted to the solemn consecration of a church or altar performed by a Bishop.

G.—Anniversary of the Election and Consecration of a Bishop.

27.—On the anniversary of the Election[67] or Translation[68] of a Bishop,[69] and of his consecration, one solemn votive Mass should be celebrated by the Bishop, or by a priest *coram Episcopo* in the Cathedral[70] of his Diocese. This Mass is obligatory when commanded by the Bishop.[71]

28.—This Mass is forbidden:

1°. On Sundays and Holydays of obligation;[72]

2°. On feasts *dupl. 1ae et 2ae classis*;[73]

3°. On Ash-Wednesday and during Holy Week;

4°. During the Octaves of Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost, and on the Octave of *Corpus Christi;*

5°. On the Vigils of Christmas and Pentecost.[74]

On these days the Mass of the current office is celebrated

[65] *Ibidem.* [66] *Vide supra* No. **24.**

[67] The anniversary of the Election or Translation of a Bishop is the day on which he was preconized in *secret Consistory*, even if he was consecrated and took possession of his diocese before the Consistory, S. R. C., December 19, 1829, n. 2672, ad 3; December 13, 1895, n. 3876, ad viii. With regard to the Coadjutor *cum jure successionis*, that day is considered as the day of the election, when the Apostolic Brie of his coadjutorship with future succession was issued, S. R. C., January 30, 1878, n. 3440, ad 2. The same is the case when a Bishop was never preconized in *secret Consistory*.

[68] When a Bishop is transferred from one diocese to another, the day of translation is celebrated instead of the day of his election to the Episcopacy, S.R.C., September 2, 1741, n. 2365, ad 6.

[69] The Ordinary. DeHerdt, *Praxis Pontif.*, vol. iii, n. 259, a.

[70] In any other church of the diocese neither the Bishop nor another *in his presence* can celebrate this Votive Mass, even when the rite permits Votive Masses, S. R. C., September 12, 1840, n. 2823, ad 1 et 2.

[71] S.R.C., Aug. 14, 1858, n. 3078 ad 1 et 2.

[72] S.R.C., May 18, 1883, n. 3575, ad iv.

[73] *Ibidem.* [74] *Ibidem* ad VI.

with all the occurring orations,[75] but the commemoration of the Anniversary is added to the principal oration *sub una conclusione*, except on *dupl. 1ae classis*, on Holy Thursday and Holy Saturday, when the commemoration is omitted.[76]

29.—If the anniversary is *accidentally* impeded by a *movable* feast *dupl. 1ae classis*, it is entirely omitted that year. If it is *yearly* impeded by a feast *dupl. 1ae classis*, it is *regularly* transferred to the next *free* day,[77] which is of a lower rite than a *dupl. 2ae classis*.[78] It was said that it is *regularly* transferred to a future day, but if the anniversary occurs on one of the last days of the year, and there is no *free* day remaining, it may be anticipated on the first day before it, which is not a *dupl. 2ae classis*.[79] If this anniversary occurs on the day of the anniversary of the Election or Coronation of the *Roman Pontiff*, that of the Bishop is transferred to the following day.[80]

30.—This solemn votive Mass is celebrated in *white* vestments, with *Gloria*, only *one* oration, *Credo*, Preface *communis* (unless another on account of an *octave* or *cycle* occur), and the Gospel of St. John at the end. If the Bishop himself celebrates the Mass, he will recite in the oration "*me indignum famulum tuum, quem huic Ecclesiae praeesse voluisti*, etc.[81]

H.—The Nuptial Mass.

31.—This Mass is found in the *fifth* part of the Missal and is entitled *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa.* It begins with the words *Deus Israel.* It contains a solemn blessing of the matrimonial contract by means of special prayers, which are recited: (1) after the *Pater Noster*, and (2) before the *Placeat* immediately preceding the blessing at the end of the Mass. There is so close a connection between this Mass and the blessing that the Mass cannot be celebrated unless the solemn blessing is given,[82] for without

[75] De Herdt, *Praxis Pontif.*, vol. iii, n. 260.
[76] S.R.C., Sept. 12, 1840, n. 2823, ad iii.
[77] S.R.C., Dec. 12, 1891, n. 3762.
[78] S.R.C. April 2, 1894, n. 3824, ad i.
[79] *Ibidem.*
[80] S.R.C., Dec. 20, 1864, n. 3132.
[81] *Caeremoniale Episc.*, lib. 2, ch. 35, 2.
[82] S.R.C., June 23, 1853, n. 3016, ad 1 et 2.

this blessing this Mass cannot be celebrated even on days on which private votive Masses are permitted.

32.—The marriage of the spouses and the nuptial blessing are not so closely united that they must be performed by one and the same priest,[83] but it is necessary that the Mass be celebrated and the nuptial blessing be given by the same priest.[84]

33.—From the *first* Sunday of Advent to the feast of the Epiphany included, and from Ash Wednesday to the Sunday *in Albis* included,[85] this votive Mass cannot be celebrated, neither can a commemoration of it be made nor the nuptial blessing be given. During these intervals the Mass of the current Office, or a votive Mass, other than that *pro Sponso et Sponsa*, if the rubrics allow it, must be celebrated, without a commemoration of the votive Mass and without the nuptial blessing.[86] If the marriage took place during the *tempus clausum* the Mass cannot be afterwards resumed, nor can the blessing be supplied.[87]

34.—Outside the *tempus clausum* this Mass is forbidden:

1°. On all Sundays and Holydays of obligation;

2°. On Feasts, *dupl. 1ae et 2ae classis;*

3°. During the Octaves of Epiphany and Pentecost;

4°. On the Vigil of Pentecost;

5°. On the Octave day of *Corpus Christi;*

6°. On days which exclude *dupl. 2ae classis;* [88]

7°. In parochial Churches, in which only *one* Mass is celebrated on the Rogation days, if the procession takes place, and on Nov. 2d, if the office of the dead is recited publicly in the Church.[89]

35.—If *extra tempus clausum* the *nuptial blessing* is to be given on days on which the votive Mass *pro Sponso et Sponsa* is forbidden,[90] the Mass of the current office is celebrated *more*

[83] S.C. Inquisit., Sept. 1, 1841, apud Collectan. S.C. de P.F., n. 1553.

[84] *Rubr. spec. ad Miss. vot. pro. sponso et sponsa posit.*

[85] These intervals are called *Tempus clausum.*

[86] S.R.C., Aug. 31, 1839, n. 2797, ad 1; June 23, 1852, n. 3016, ad 3.

[87] Appeltern, *Manuale Lit.*, Tom. I, p. 154, note 4; S.R.C., Aug. 31, 1839, n. 2797, ad 3.

[88] S.R.C., March 3, 1818, n. 2582; *Rubr. Spec. Miss. ante Missam pro Sponso et Sponsa.*

[89] Auctores gen.

[90] *Vide supra* n. **34.**

festivo and the commemoration of the nuptial Mass is added after the *commemorationes speciales or communes*,[91] even on feasts *dupl. 1ae classis*, but always *sub distincta conclusione*.[92] It must be said before the *commemorationes votivae* and the *imperata*. In the Mass, the prayers constituting the nuptial blessing after the *Pater Noster* and before the *Placeat* are said in the same manner as if the nuptial votive Mass were celebrated.

36.—On all days other than those excepted [93] the *Missa votiva pro Sponso et Sponsa* must be celebrated,[94] but always as a *private* votive Mass, even if it is celebrated *solemniter* or *in cantu*.[95] The color of the vestments is *white*, without *Gloria*, at least three orations,[96] without *Credo*, Preface *communis*, except in an octave or cycle which has a proper Preface, *Benedicamus Domino* and Gospel of St. John at the end.[97]

37.—If the *Sponsa* is a widow, who received the nuptial blessing at a former marriage, then this nuptial blessing cannot be given nor can this nuptial Mass be celebrated.[98] If they desire a Mass, another votive Mass may be said, if the rubrics allow it, or the Mass of the current feast may be celebrated, but a commemoration of the nuptial Mass *cannot* be made.

Note 1.—If the spouses are unwilling to receive the nuptial blessing, they cannot be forced to it, although they should be admonished to receive it.[99]

Note 2.—Although a priest is obliged *nisi gravis et rationalis adsit causa* to celebrate the *Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa*,[100] he is

[91] S.R.C., April 20, 1822, n. 2619, ad 8.

[92] *Ibidem*, ad 6.

[93] *Vide supra* n. **34**.

[94] S.R.C., June 23, 1853, n. 3016, ad 1.

[95] S.R.C., Febr. 28, 1818, n. 2582.

[96] The *first* proper of this Mass, the *second* of the office of the day, the *third* special commemoration, if such occurs, otherwise the *commemoratio communis* which is recited in the Mass of a semiduplex office at that time of the year. If it is a feast of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the *commemoratio communis* is *A cunctis*, the words *beata Maria* are omitted. Van der Stappen, Quaest 306.

[97] S.R.C., Feb. 28, 1818, n. 2582.

[98] S.R.C., March 3, 1761, n. 2461, ad 1. S.C. Inquisit., August 31, 1881, apud Collectan. S. C. de P. F., n. 1560.

[99] *Ibidem*.

[100] S. C. de P. F., Sept. 21, 1843, apud Collectan, n. 1554.

not obliged to apply it for them, unless he has received a stipend for it.[101]

Note 3.—The Mass may be celebrated and the nuptial blessing given even if the spouses do not receive Holy Communion during it.[102]

Note 4—At one and the same Mass several nuptials may be blessed, but the nuptial blessing is recited only *once*, and without any change.[103]

I.—Masses Celebrated by Priests having Defective Sight.

38.—By Apostolic Indult, to priests who are almost blind is sometimes granted the permission to celebrate the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, or a *Requiem*, when the rubrics allow it. This faculty is obtained from the Roman Pontiff or from the S. C. Concilii. Sometimes Bishops obtain the faculty to grant this permission.[104] If the indult says *dummodo orator non sit omnino caecus*, and in the meantime he becomes totally blind, he must abstain from celebrating till he has received another indult.[105] In such cases, having obtained a new indult, he must procure the assistance of another priest, although this obligation is not inserted in the new indult.[106] If the Indult says *cum alio assistente sacerdote*, he must obtain such assistance.[107] The assistant priest, who is vested in surplice (from the Consecration to the Communion he uses the stole also), performs all the duties which the Deacon performs during a solemn High Mass.[108]

39.—Concerning this faculty the following may be noted:

(*a*) The conditions attached to this privilege are not simply forms of the *Curia*, but oblige *in conscience*.[109]

(*b*) By it permission is granted to celebrate daily either the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, or a *Requiem*, when the rubrics allow it.[110]

[101] S. C. Inquisit., Sept. 1, 1841.
[102] S.R.C., March 21, 1874, n. 3329.
[103] Auctores gen.
[104] Schober, App. iii, c. 8, 1.
[105] *Ibidem*, ad 3.
[106] *Ibidem*, ad 2.
[107] *Ibidem*.
[108] *Ibidem*.
[109] S.R.C., March 16, 1805, n. 2560, ad 4.
[110] Schober, App. iii. ch. 8, 1 b.

(*c*) This votive Mass is celebrated every day of the year, even on days *dupl. 1ae classis*,[111] on all Sundays and feasts of the Blessed Virgin.[112]

(*d*) The Mass of the Blessed Virgin is the *fifth* of the Missal (*A Pentecoste usque ad Adventum*), but any of the other Masses of the Blessed Virgin may be celebrated in their proper season, if it can be easily done.[113]

(*e*) This Mass is celebrated in *white* vestments, without *Gloria*, except on Saturdays,[114] without the commemoration of the occurring feasts, ferial, or the *imperata;* the second oration will be *de Spiritu Sancto;* and the third *Ecclesiae* or *pro Papa*, without *Credo*, even on Sundays and on solemn feasts.[115]; Preface *Et te in veneratione, Benedicamus Domino*,[116] and the Gospel of St. John at the end.

Note I.—On Christmas he is allowed to celebrate only *one* Mass,[117] and on the last three days of Holy Week he must abstain from celebrating.[118]

Note II.—Bishops who have obtained this privilege for themselves are allowed to use the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin, even at ordinations, provided they take place *extra tempora*.[119]

40.—On feasts of a semiduplex rite or ferials, when the rubrics allow it, he may celebrate a Requiem, which must always be the *quotidiana*, with the orations found in the Missal in this Mass.[120]

[A Missal for the use of the Blind, containing the votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin and the *Requiem*, with the *Ordo* and *Canon Missae* in large and raised type, has been published by Pustet & Co., with the special approbation of the S. Congregation of Rites.]

S. L. T.

[111] S.R.C., April 28, 1866, n. 3146, ad 1.

[112] S.R.C., Sept. 11, 1847, n. 5102, ad 7.

[113] Aertnys, *Comp. Lit. Sacr.*, n. 140, 2°.

[114] S.R.C., February 23, 1839, n. 2788, ad 1.

[115] S.R.C., April 28, 1866, n. 3146.

[116] Except on Saturdays because the *Gloria* has been recited, when the *Ite Missa est* is said.

[117] S.R.C., April 11, 1840, n. 2802, ad 3.

[118] Aertnys, *Comp. Lit. Sacr.*, n. 140, 1°.

[119] S.R.C., February 9, 1867, n. 3152.

[120] *Ibidem* 4°.

Analecta.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

Nonnulla solvuntur dubia.

Hodierni Caeremoniarum Magistri in Ecclesia Cathedrali de Queretaro in Mexicana Ditione, de consensu et approbatione Rmi sui Episcopi, quae subsequuntur dubia Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi pro opportuna solutione humillime exposuerunt; nimirum:

I. In ecclesia Cathedrali de Queretaro, a tempore suae erectionis, qualibet tertia Dominica mensis, Missa Conventualis canitur coram SS. Sacramento palam exposito, quod processionaliter per ecclesiam gestatur, dictis in Choro, post Missam, Sexta et Nona. Nunc vero quaeritur: An licite continuari possit mos cantandi Missam praefatam coram SS. Sacramento?

II. Ex praescripto Caeremonialis Episcoporum, Lib. I, Cap. 9, n. 6, et Lib. II, Cap. 29, n. 3, in Missis Pontificalibus "Confiteor" canendum est a Diacono, si facienda sit Communio generalis aut particularis aliquorum. Nonnulli vero Rubricistae putant cantum "Confiteor" debere pariter habere locum in qualibet Missa solemni, licet non Pontificali, et quamvis sit de Requie, si S. Communio fidelibus in ipsa distribuatur. Quum autem hoc manifeste non constet ex ipso Caeremoniali, sed potius locus sit dubitandi, quaeritur: Utrum "Confiteor" cani debeat in omnibus Missis solemnibus, non Pontificalibus, et etiam de Requie, ante distributionem SSmae Eucharistiae?

III. Ex concessione Sacrae Rituum Congregationis, facta in approbatione kalendarii dioecesani, celebratur in Dioecesi de Queretaro Festum B. M. V. sub titulo *Refugium peccatorum*, ritu duplici 2ae cl., et usque nunc divinum Officium semper persolutum est ut in Festis B. M. V. per annum, praeter lectiones II Noct., quae sumuntur de die 8 Septemb., mutato verbo "Natali" in "Festivitate." In Breviariis vero, inter quos Ratisbonense, rubrica apposita in praedicta festivitate tantum dicit: "omnia ut in Festis B. M. V. per annum." Hinc quaeritur: Quae lectiones II Noct. dicendae sint memorata die?

IV. Die 18 Iunii decurrentis anni, ad dubium: "Quinam versiculus sumendus est in Officio proprio S. Iacobi Apostoli, quod in Codice Hispano invenitur die 25 Iulii, ad II Vesperas; nam diversae editiones Breviarii non sunt inter se conformes?" S. R. C. die 18 Iulii rescripsit:—"In casu stetur Proprio Hispano." Sed cum diversae istius Codicis editiones discrepent inter se, nonnullae enim ponant versiculum "Annuntiaverunt" et aliae "Nimis honorati," nunc ergo iterum quaeritur: Qualis versiculus ex duobus praedictis dicendus est?

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque accurate perpensis, respondendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative*, de licentia tamen Ordinarii.

Ad II. *Quoad primam partem:* Dicendum *Confiteor* alta voce vel cantando, iuxta consuetudinem; et *quoad alteram*, in Missis solemnibus sive cantatis de Requie, iuxta praxim Urbis, Communio distribui non solet, sed ubi ex rationabili causa distribuenda foret, Diaconus dicet *Confiteor* tantum alta voce.

Ad III. Ut in Festis B. M. V. per annum.

Ad IV. Dicatur versiculus: *Annuntiaverunt.*

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 28 Novembris 1902.

D. *Card.* Ferrata, *S. R. C. Pro-Praef.*

L. † S. D. Panici, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

Instituitur Commissio historico-liturgica.

Sacra Rituum Congregatio, probante Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone PP. XIII, peculiarem Commissionem historico-

liturgicam constituit quam constare voluit ex quinque eximiis sacerdotibus RR. DD. Aloysio Duchesne, Iosepho Wilpert, Francisco Ehrle, Iosepho Roberti, Humberto Benigni et Ioanne Mercati. Atque insuper, annuente eodem Sanctissimo Domino Nostro, Sacra eadem Congregatio sibi facultatem reservavit seligendi in posterum nonnullos socios consulentes qui ad opus apti videantur. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 28 Novembris 1902.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Pro-Praef.*

L. † S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen.*, *Secret.*

III.

CIRCA CONSUETUDINEM THURIFICANDI STATUAS IN CASU.

In aliquibus paroeciis huius Dioeceseos ritu Ambrosiano utentibus, occurrentibus solemnitatibus patronalibus ceterisque Festis cum exteriori pompa concursuque populi concelebratis, simulacrum Sancti, cuius solemnia perficiuntur, prius in medio templi exponi, deinde, pomeridianis horis, a sodalibus Confraternitatis in respectiva paroecia erectae, processionaliter deferri solet.

Hisce in adiunctis ab immemorabili viget consuetudo, ut, sive mane ad Offertorium Missae solemnis, sive post meridiem dum canitur *Magnificat* inter Vesperas, ab eo qui Diaconi munere fungitur, nonnullis Confraternitatis sodalibus cum intortitiis comitantibus, post Cleri incensationem, haec sacra Icon thure adoleatur. Hinc quaeritur:

I. An tolerari possit praefata consuetudo, nempe ut huiusmodi thurificatio fiat, uti supra describitur, a Diacono?

II. Et quatenus *negative* ad I, an statuae in medio ecclesiae eminentis incensatio, tum intra Missam tum intra Vesperas prorsus omittenda sit?

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, reque mature perpensa, respondendum censuit:

Ad I. *Negative.*

Ad II. Attenta consuetudine, thurificari potest praedicta statua in Vesperis dumtaxat, ab ipsomet celebrante, post incensationem SS. Sacramenti, ad normam Decr. n. 3547, *Sanctorien.* 4 Maii 1882.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 28 Novembris 1902.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *S. R. C. Pro-Praef.*

L. † S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen.*, *Secret.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

S. Congregation of Rites: 1. Decides (*a*) that the custom of singing on the third Sunday of the month the community Mass in presence of the Blessed Sacrament exposed may be maintained. (*b*) "Confiteor" may be sung or recited aloud during the distribution of Communion at Solemn Masses, where such usage already obtains, although the giving of Communion at such Masses is not customary in Rome. (*c*) The Office of Our Lady, Refuge of Sinners, follows that of the Feasts B. V. M. throughout the year.

2. Publishes the names of the six members of the recently appointed Historico-Liturgical Commission—the Revv. Aloysius Duchesne, Joseph Wilpert, Francis Ehrle, Joseph Roberti, Humbert Benigni, and John Mercati.

3. Answers a question regarding the incensation of the statue of the Saint whose feast is being celebrated.

VALIDITY OF THE BAPTISM OF "BAPTISTS."

To the Editor of The Ecclesiastical Review:

In the January number of the Review, in the article on the validity of Baptism as administered by the Campbellites, you state (p. 82), "The Baptism administered . . . by Baptists, who believe in the necessity of regeneration by means of Baptism *as established by Christ*, is presumably valid."

Is this statement correct? I am of the opinion that the validity of the Baptism of the Baptists is more open to question than that of the Disciples. In truth I have hesitated to baptize even "conditionaliter" converts from the sect of the Disciples because it seemed to me that their baptism has all the essentials of matter, form and intention; I never knew it to be questioned until I read your article in the January number. On the other hand the baptism of the Baptists seems to me to be wanting in the requisite intention *to do what Christ*

ordained to be done. I base my objection on the following experience: In 1886 I instructed in the Catholic faith a young woman who had been immersed when fourteen years of age by a Dr. Mabie, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Indianapolis. In making inquiry as to the validity of this baptism I called upon Dr. Reuben Jeffreys, the pastor of the same church, the immediate successor of Dr. Mabie, a man of distinction in his denomination. From him I learned the mode of baptism as administered in the Baptist denomination. It seemed to me that there could be no doubt as to the matter and form, unless, indeed, as to the simultaneity of the words and the act of immersion, but he made it quite clear that the intention of the minister is *not* to do what Christ ordained. The idea of intention, he said, had never before occurred to him, but he was certain that no Baptist minister had any other intention than to do *what John the Baptist* had done. There was no such thing, he declared, as "Christian" baptism; it was a misnomer; all that Christ had done was to submit to John's baptism and thus approve of it, and that the commission: "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," etc., meant to continue to do what John the Baptist had done.

Dr. Jeffreys added that while each congregation of Baptists was independent of every other in all things, yet there was a consensus of opinion among Baptists that the rite was that of John and not of Christ.

While the subject of baptismal regeneration as such was not discussed I gathered from the conversation that the Baptists do not hold to it as strongly as your article would imply. The preacher held that it is the faith of the believer which justifies and not the outward rite of baptism; the latter, he said was a mere sign and public declaration of preëxisting faith. Baptism, he said, was therefore not necessary for salvation. "You love your country," he said, "and therefore you put a flag at your window as a token of your patriotism. The showing of the flag does not make you a patriot—you are that before you put out your flag—you are that even without the flag. So with baptism—it is a token of your faith and a symbol of your obedience to Christ, submitting to baptism as He did."

With Dr. Jeffreys' consent I made full notes of the conversation and read them to ascertain their correctness. I regret that I cannot now find these notes, but I have reproduced the substance of them from memory.

During the conversation I noticed on Dr. Jeffreys' desk a New

Testament. His views were so surprising that I took up the Testament and read to him Acts 19, verses 1–5, in which it is related how St. Paul at Ephesus "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" those who had been baptized in "John's baptism," and asked him how he reconciled what he had said with the action of St. Paul. He replied: "Paul had no business to do that; he changed the whole idea of baptism; Christ did not institute baptism; He merely approved John's baptism."

I need not add that with the approval of the Bishop I did for my Baptist neophyte what the Apostle did for the Ephesian Baptists.

FRANCIS H. GAVISK.

Indianapolis, Ind., April 4, 1903.

Resp. We could hardly have used any other form of words to express precisely what we meant when we said that the baptism administered "by Baptists *who believe in the necessity of regeneration by means of Baptism as established by Christ is presumably valid.*"

There are many kinds of Baptists—Freewill Baptists, German Baptists (Dunkers), General Baptists, Old-School Baptists, Seven-Day Baptists, Six-Principle Baptists, etc. These differ as widely in their belief regarding the purpose and efficacy of Baptism as do the Calvinists of the sixteenth century from that section of the Campbellites who maintain the perpetual obligation of the washing of feet as an institution of Christ. The term "Baptist" as a general designation of doctrinal tenet is, so far as the institution of sacramental rites is concerned, supposed to uphold the principles of Calvin. Now Calvin did not, so far as we are aware, refer the institution of the Sacrament of Baptism to St. John the Baptist. On the contrary, while he discarded five sacraments he maintained Baptism to be one of the two mediums instituted by Christ for man's salvation.

The practical lesson to be derived from the present condition among Protestants who profess Christian doctrine is, that we can hardly ever accept a superficial assurance regarding the validity of their baptism. Each case demands careful separate inquiry (as the Council of Baltimore directs). If the reception of valid Baptism is doubtful, the sacramental rite is repeated conditionally. In questions regarding the validity of a marriage contracted between

Catholics and parties baptized outside the Catholic Church, the rules (which generally favor the validity) are to be observed as in every other case of doubtful marriage. For the rest, we refer the reader to what we have already said on this subject in the discussion regarding the "Disciples of Christ" in our last number. (See THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April, page 461.)

THE ABBÉ LOISY'S VIEWS.

SIR:—In the April number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW I find this statement:

"In no case could we give Loisy's views our unqualified approval. In the *Études bibliques* the author is rather unsatisfactory on the questions of the authenticity and historicity of the Fourth Gospel, on its apparent disagreements with the Synoptic Gospels, and on Biblical inerrancy in general: *il ne s'agit plus de savoir si la Bible contient des erreurs, mais bien de savoir ce que la Bible contient de vérité. Que vaut la Bible?*" (Page 471.)

The words in italics, I take it, are quoted to show how the Abbé Loisy is unsatisfactory on Biblical inerrancy in general. I wish to point out that he uses the words, not to express an opinion, but to show what rationalistic and Protestant criticism has come to. The whole paragraph stands thus:

"La question biblique, en effet, n'est pas pour nous un simple thème de discussions théologiques analogue à celui qu'agitent en des sens divers les thomistes et les molinistes. Elle est aussi et d'abord une question d'histoire et de critique historique. Depuis plus d'un siècle, la critique rationaliste et protestante s'est emparée de la Bible, l'a disséquée comme une pièce d'anatomie, en a discuté les origines. Tous les problèmes qu'elle a soulevés se ramènent à un seul, dont l'énoncé diffère notablement de celui qui résume la question biblique pour les théologiens. Il ne s'agit plus de savoir si la Bible contient des erreurs mais bien de savoir ce que la Bible contient de vérité. 'Que vaut la Bible?' Telle est la question que l'exégèse non-catholique fait retentir à nos oreilles par un si grand nombre de voix qu'il n'est plus en notre pouvoir de ne pas l'entendre. Nous devons opposer à la science rationaliste la science catholique de l'Écriture." (*Etudes bibliques*, page 43.)

I read this passage as meaning: "The Bible question, in fact, is not one for theological discussion alone, like, for instance, the question that divided opinion between the Thomists and the Molinists. It is

likewise and primarily a question of history and of the criticism of history. More than a century ago rationalist and Protestant critics took the Bible and subjected it to a *quasi*-anatomical dissection, making its origin the matter of their inquiry. The problems consequently raised resolve themselves into one which, when formulated, differs notably from that which has to be dealt with by theologians. With the rationalist the question is no longer one of finding out whether the Bible contains errors, but of finding out what are the truths contained in the Bible. 'What does the Bible amount to?' This is the question that non-Catholic critics have dinned into our ears so loudly and repeatedly that we can no longer allow it to pass unheeded. We must therefore meet rationalistic science with Catholic science of Scripture."

It was not fair dealing to take the sentence out of the context. Again, this statement occurs:

"Finally, Loisy is not ashamed to have recourse to the claptrap sophism that a supernatural fact cannot be established by a natural proof; hence neither the Resurrection of our Lord nor His apparitions can produce unequivocal certainty in the mind of the historian." (Page 474.)

As this passage stands it is misleading and does not accurately represent the Abbé Loisy's position. This position would have been better able to be understood, had the writer ended his sentence somewhat in this way, "in the mind of one who deals with these truths not as a theologian arguing from faith, but as a historian arguing from historical data." I may point out, in the pages referred to (74–75) by the writer, a passage written from this position:

"Avant tout examen des récits, il est permis de penser que des impressions sensibles ne sont pas le témoinage adéquat d'une réalité purement surnaturelle. Jésus ressuscité apparaissait et disparaissait à la manière des esprits; pendant l'apparition, il était visible, palpable, et on pouvait l'entendre comme un homme à l'état naturel. Ce mélange de qualités peut-il inspirer une confiance entière à l'historien qui aborde la question *sans foi préalable ?*[1] Évidemment non. L'historien [*i. e.*, as a historian] réservera son adhesion, parce que la réalité objective des apparitions ne se définit pas *pour lui* avec une précision suffisante" (page 75).

Turning to *L'Évangile et l'Église* I find the Abbé Loisy stating the position he takes up in that work:

[1] The italics are mine. J. F. S.

"C'est en effect au point de vue de l'histoire que l'on a voulu se mettre dans cette étude. On ne s'est nullement proposé d'écrire l'apologie du catholicisme et du dogme traditionnel. Si l'on avait eu cette intention, le present travail serait très défectueux et incomplet, notamment en ce qui regarde la divinité du Christ et l'autorité de l'Église. On n'entend pas démontrer ici ni la vérité de l'Évangile ni celle du christianisme catholque, mais on essaie seulement d'analyser et de définir le rapport qui les unit dans l'histoire. *Le lecteur de bonne foi ne s'y trompera pas*" (page vii). (Italics are mine.)

J. F. S.

London, England, April 6, 1903.

REPLY.

For the sake of clearness we shall consider the critic's two animadversions separately:

1. The critic is right in maintaining that the passage quoted from the *Études bibliques*, p. 43, does not prove that the Abbé Loisy holds unsatisfactory views on Biblical inerrancy. But the critic is wrong in his opinion that THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, for April, p. 271, puts forth such a proof. The words *il ne s'agit plus*, etc., are printed without quotation marks, without reference to volume and page, without any sign that they are Loisy's own utterances. If the reader did not know that the words are Loisy's, he could not learn it from the passage in question. He would understand them as the REVIEW wishes them to be understood: In the case of Loisy, *il ne s'agit plus*, etc. The words are not a proof; they are only a statement concerning Loisy's views. The proof for the statement is partially given in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for March, 1902, p. 351, as quoted on p. 471 of the April number, 1903.[2]

2. With regard to the critic's second animadversion, we do not see why we should state Loisy's views more clearly than the Abbé himself does. The critic feels that Loisy is not as clear as we are expected to be, since he interpolates "(*i. e.*, as a historian)," in the quotation from p. 75. We feel the less need of greater clearness on this point, since we are convinced that "a historian, arguing from historical data," can attain to full historical certainty of the Resurrection. A supernatural fact can, therefore, be established from natural proof.

[2] THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April, 1903, p. 471, erroneously prints p. 342, instead of p. 351.

THE STIPEND FOR THE SECOND MASS ON SUNDAYS.

The question whether a priest authorized to say two Masses in his parish on Sundays, may accept a stipend for at least one of the Masses, recurs periodically, and although we have already discussed the subject very fully in the REVIEW, there appears to be reason for repeating the substance of the argument determining the answer.

The general law of the Church, according to the interpretation of the Council of Trent,[1] forbids any priest to accept two stipends for two Masses celebrated on the same day by reason of the privilege of bination. A priest may, therefore, take only one stipend.

Can parish priests (pastors or rectors) do this? Not generally. Since a canonically instituted parish priest is understood to receive a regular stipend for the fulfilment of his pastoral function which *obliges him to offer the parochial Mass for his flock* on all Sundays and holidays of obligation, he cannot lawfully receive a stipend for the second Mass. The ordinary emolument of his parochial office is considered as the equivalent of a stipend for the parochial Mass. This has been decided by the Instruction of the Propaganda to which our note above refers.

But in the United States the condition of canonically instituted parishes, which regulates the obligation of a pastor, is not fully recognized. Only in the Archdiocese of St. Louis, where the legislation of the Council of Trent was introduced under the former rule of France, does our Church law admit the existence of canonical parishes; and in these the above-mentioned obligation of pastors to celebrate the parochial Mass on Sundays and holidays forbids them to receive any further stipend for the two Masses than is guaranteed by the regular income of their pastoral office.

For the rest of our clergy, even those who are called "irremovable rectors," there is no strict or defined obligation on the part of pastors to say the parochial Mass for their flocks; for since they obtain their parochial sustenance, not from any legal ecclesi-

[1] "Visum est expedire eam promulgare regulam quam constanter tenuit Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum Patrum Concilii Tridentini Interpretum, videlicet ex praxi generali presbyteris non concedi eleemosynam recipere pro secunda missa, etiamsi de illis agatur qui parochiali munere instructi ideo stipendium pro prima missa nequeunt obtinere, quod eam *pro populo* applicare teneantur. *Lit. Encycl. de Prop. Fide*, October 15, 1863. Cf. *Collectan. Mission.* edit. Propag., 1893, n. 887."

astical foundations, but rather through the charity of the faithful who contribute according to their varying means, there is no canonical title binding pastors or rectors in justice to the duty of offering the parish Mass exclusively for their flocks.

Hence a missionary or an irremovable rector, outside the authoritatively recognized canonical parishes, does not violate the canon law of the Church if he accept a stipend for one of the two Masses said by him on Sundays and holidays of obligation.

Nevertheless, it is plain that, if there is no canonical title to enforce as an *obligation in justice* the return which a pastor owes his people for the contributions by which they sustain him, that obligation still exists as one of equity. For if the charity of the flock allows the minister of the altar to live by the altar, his service is due to them in an equal measure of charity. Hence it is generally understood and endorsed by the authoritative opinion of diocesan legislators that parish priests with us are bound *in charity* to offer the parish Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation for their flocks. And in this endorsement the local Councils as legislative organs seem to assume the position of those who, recognizing the source of a strict obligation in their receiving a living out of the regular income of the parish, are prohibited from accepting any further stipend for the two Masses than that guaranteed to them by their ordinary pastoral income.

This is the sense in which the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, the various Provincial Councils in the United States, and the theologians who comment on the subject, have interpreted the obligation of pastors in the United States. In brief: Pastors and rectors are bound *in charity* to say the parish Mass on Sundays and holidays. This sense of obligation appears to imply an analogous obligation not to accept a further stipend for either of the two Masses said on such days.[2]

THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSIONS' REPORTS.

The Very Rev. Dr. Middleton's review of the Religious and Educational questions in the Philippines, based upon a careful examination of the Commissioners' Reports for 1899 and 1900, has been circulated abroad, not only among our subscribers, but

[2] *Cf.* Sabetti-Barrett, *Theol. Moral.*, n. 710, qu. 3.

also among the leaders of public opinion, State officials, editors, and prominent society men. Naturally it has met with generous appreciation by all who understood the true purpose of the publication.

That purpose was not, as appears to have been thought by some, to make a case of defence for the Friars. Not at all. Our Friars have had ample opportunity to defend themselves these three years. They had access to the reliable data; they had the favor of Catholic public opinion; they had the channels of publication; and they were quite willing, to be sure, to make use of both, and they did so. If overzealous friends in the name of the Catholic cause thought it necessary to use measures and make statements which are unsafe in such cases and likely to turn to the disadvantage of the Friars by stirring up a just resentment on the part of those who could help us to obtain fair judgment, it was not the fault of the Religious. We called attention to this fact, and earned some abuse from at least those who read our criticism in a superficial light or who were too much absorbed in their own prejudices to see that an emphatic statement of assured facts would go much further than an exaggerated and bitter acclaim, in securing a fair settlement of the question. Happily, the men at the helm did not take much account of the mere noise, when they had located it; and the real influences which have brought things to a thus far favorable issue came from quite different sources than has been generally suspected.

Our real object in printing Dr. Middleton's statement at this time is simply to present our readers with an historical record of the *facts*, now that these have been made clear beyond doubt. We requested the learned Augustinian to furnish us such a summary several months since, when certain publications from the Filipino press had appeared and when it had been settled that the Holy See was to replace the Spanish heads of ecclesiastical departments in the islands by American bishops and priests, so far as that could be done without injury to the established religious order.

If such a record should serve as a defence, even at this late day, of the principle of religious freedom to which our Orders in the Philippines lay just claim, it is all the better. But we do not intend that it be more than a *vindication*, a clear array of methods

and facts that will serve as a precedent and illustration in later days, because their objective truthfulness cannot be called in question. And this is the difference between a record of hasty statements made prematurely, which, when shown to be inaccurate, become worthless for ever, and statements that are unquestioned and permanent weapons, which allow us, if rightly used, to reverse a wrong or unjust policy even at a late day.

Those who charge us therefore with being silent when we were uncertain, and being late rather than wrong, mistake entirely our object, which was not to defend a political attitude, but to vindicate principle. This has been from the outset the declared programme of the REVIEW, as it is of THE DOLPHIN,—namely, to deal with questions of the day *only in their principles.* And when we mentioned the Philippine controversy, from the first it was not to take party place, but solely to recall a fundamental principle of defence.

Nor can we complain that this has not been fully understood by those of our editors who stand for thoughtful and independent management in their important calling. Thus, the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen*, in its two editorials of March 21st, says of Dr. Middleton's pamphlet:

"Father Middleton is acute, but not vituperative. His argument is such as would appeal to a bench of judges. We do not say that it is altogether a judicial review. In some respects it is the presentation of a skilful advocate; but it is a good, clever document notwithstanding.

"We may say that Father Middleton accuses the Commissions of one grave neglect, which is, however, virtually a neglect of the Friars, to wit: 'There was no proper representation for the defence' [the Friars]. The witnesses who appeared were mostly anti-friar, but 'no testimony was barred.' That the Friars and the Central Catholic Society of Manila (if it then existed) did not exert themselves to put in strong testimony for what they believed the truth, was not the fault of the Commissions. Father Middleton alleges nothing to show that such testimony would be excluded, if offered. Father Middleton's strong points relate to the carelessness with which testimony was received, the want of character in the witnesses, and other errors in the procedure, which would give the mass of testimony produced very little value under the rules of evidence generally accepted in American courts."

In a second article the editor analyzes the critique of Dr. Middleton, to show that President Roosevelt and Governor Taft had received certain prejudiced information regarding Philippine Church affairs as an inheritance from the previous administration, but that there were circumstances which could easily mislead to a confirmation of the prejudices. Mr. Desmond is indeed in

error when he concludes that there were "only 150 of the clergy natives;" there were actualy 675, which number makes them forty-three per cent., instead of ten per cent., of the entire clerical force.

Dr. A. J. Faust, an observant and experienced journalist who writes editorially for *The New Century* (Washington, D. C.), refers to the Philippine controversy, as it was carried on for a considerable time, as follows:

"The example has brought home to us all that there are Catholic journalists who not infrequently jeopard their reputations for justice and honesty of public teaching. In the parlance of the day, they go off half-cocked in order to be among the earliest in the thickest of the fray. . . . Editorial members of the press within the clerical ranks, in public questions are strongly entrenched, as a rule, behind the ramparts of partisan politics. The Rev. H. J. Heuser does not belong to the one-sided class of editors of whom I am speaking, and his judicious treatment of the question of the Friars in the Philippines commends anew THE DOLPHIN to intelligent readers. He opens his admirable paper with a clear-cut statement of the Catholic position at the outset in these words: 'The central facts are . . .'"

Speaking of Dr. Middleton's labors in particular, the same writer says:

"Father Middleton writes with force, candor, and calmness. He has given the best historical resumé which has yet appeared on the vexed question of the Friars, and his carefully prepared paper will, without doubt, receive the close attention of all readers desiring information not filtered through political partisanship. In addition to the critical ability which the writer shows in his examination of documents, there is manifested a spirit of exactness, free from passion, which the fair-minded must greatly admire. Within our scope it is impossible to do more than commend this valuable review, and especially now, when its contents are to be reproduced in pamphlet form, for general circulation among Catholic societies. It is to be hoped that such organizations will lend their aid to further its distribution among their membership."

The Boston *Pilot*, though always strong in the expression of its political convictions, speaks no less judiciously of the position which THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN have assumed in this matter of vindicating a principle which is fundamental in all true religion, and without which there can be no just defence of rights. In an editorial of March 14th, the *Pilot* says:

"No one who knows the Reverend editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN could for a moment suspect him of intemperate and unreasoning partisanship.

"In the controversy arising out of the reports of Dr. Schurman and Judge Taft on matters religious and educational in the Philippines; the establishment of the American public school system in these islands; the Taft Commission at the Vatican—the editor of the publications above named asserted his faith in the good intentions of the American Government, deprecated such Catholic press criticism as had not

impregnable foundation in knowledge, and touched on certain changes which the 'new order' seemed to demand in the nationality of the priests serving the Church in those islands. . . .

"With these facts in hand, the authority of the Taft and Schurman reports as historical documents is discredited as they could not be by passionate invective or assumption; and no one will be readier to set them aside than the fair-minded President who sent the Commission to Rome, who has put a Catholic on the Philippine Commission, and who has throughout the whole affair shown an eye single to justice."

The *Ave Maria*, whilst it does not approve the attitude of writers "who seemed to have greater fear of incurring the suspicion of disloyalty to the Government than of incurring the guilt of injustice to their co-religionists in the Philippines"—which is a perfectly just sentiment—regrets that the information contained in the pamphlet was not afforded sooner. But we ask whose fault was it, if fault there was; or was it advisable to "make up" information after the manner of certain Associated Press agents, which might easily be disproved, as in fact some of it was, to the great danger of a just cause, for which even Protestant writers, like Professor Bourne, were prepared to furnish evidence if needed.

"It is not too much to say of Father Middleton's pamphlet, 'Religion and Education in the Philippines,' that it is the most complete and satisfactory exposé yet issued of the reports furnished to our Government by the Commissions to the Islands headed by Dr. Schurman and Judge Taft. On the subjects of religion and education these reports are shown to be inaccurate, incomplete, and unfair."

Dr. Hart, the editor of the (Cincinnati) *Catholic Telegraph*, writes in a similarly fair-minded strain, under date of March 26th:

"In the current issue of THE DOLPHIN, the finest high-class Catholic magazine published in this country, there is an article on the 'Philippine Commissions,' which, for its keen analysis of the subject and its exhibition of documentary testimony, surpasses anything we have read on our colonial possessions. The author is the Very Rev. Thomas C. Middleton, D.D., O.S.A., of Villanova College, Pa., and he discusses, in detail, the report of the Schurman Commission and the report of the Taft Commission. Dr. Middleton makes the specific charges that the reports were framed in defiance of the canon of judicial as well as historic equity, and that the Commissioners were grievously at fault in the taking of testimony, sinning against almost every law in this regard. He marshals his evidence in a splendid manner, and conquers all doubt about the truth of his charges."

But we do not wish to drag out this subject beyond its legitimate scope. It is likely to come up again, year after year, as the Commissions' Reports are turned in to our Government; and if bigotry should be sufficiently aroused, we may have to recall the facts that are stated in Dr. Middleton's admirable review. They

will serve probably better purpose than the tirades of editors who believe that noise is strength.

THE DISCUSSION "DE CARENTIA OVARIORUM."

Father Casacca publishes in a pamphlet, which reaches us just as we are going to press, his contention that the "carentia ovariorum" constitutes a diriment impediment of marriage. Our readers will remember that several articles on the subject appeared in this REVIEW during the winter quarter. Father Casacca wrote the first paper in the December number (pages 609–618). Some objections being raised against his argument by the Ordinary of one of our principal dioceses, we invited the Rev. Jos. Hild, C.SS.R., Professor of Moral Theology at Ilchester College, and also a representative Jesuit theologian to express their views on the subject. The Jesuit Father did not reply. Father Hild's criticism we printed in the following (January) number. Father Casacca answered the objections in a lengthy paper for February (pages 149–162). It was Fr. Hild's turn to say the next word, which he would have done had not serious illness prevented his writing.

As Father Casacca's article had raised a difficulty which demanded a *practical* solution, we asked P. Lehmkuhl, the eminent Jesuit moralist, for his view of the case. We intimated to him that it was necessary to give satisfaction to our readers who might have to deal with the subject in their pastoral mission. P. Lehmkuhl at once wrote a brief but pointed analysis of the whole case, and without referring to Fr. Casacca in particular (since the latter had merely reproduced a difficulty already discussed some years ago by the two Roman professors, P. Antonelli and P. Eschbach), showed that whatever might be said *speculatively* or *theoretically* on the subject, it had been *practically* settled by Rome's answer to a similar case, and unless the Roman Congregation saw fit to reverse or supersede certain decisions, upon new grounds, there was *practically* no reason for advocating a change in the present policy which regarded the *carentia ovariorum* as an impedient impediment simply, but which did not annul a marriage until Rome should so decide.

Under these conditions we deemed it our duty not to prolong

indefinitely a discussion which might be read in P. Antonelli's book with P. Eschbach's reply. We therefore made a brief resumé of the state of the question for the satisfaction of our readers, expressing at the same time the desire that the discussion, to which four articles had been devoted, might cease. To this Fr. Casacca has apparently taken exception, and accordingly publishes his further remarks in a pamphlet wherein he refers to our reluctance to prolong the dispute in the following terms:

"Quod accidisse videtur editori cujusdam periodici, cui titulus AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, in quo hanc disputationem inceperamus. Ille enim, lingua vernacula usus, praepostere ac prorsus injuria, discussionem tanti momenti in medio ex abrupto jugulavit, antequam debita hinc inde responsa adducerentur: ac judicem se hujus perdifficilis quaestionis constituens, loco servandi altum silentium, levia de ipsa ac omnino erronea produxit, quae partium studium manifeste redolent" (p. 1).

Of Father Lehmkuhl's article, he speaks as follows:

In periodici AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW editione pro mense Martio articulus lucem aspexit, cujus auctor controversiam de carentia ovariorum taliter dirimere conatur, ut sententia eorum, qui carentiam illam impedimentum dirimens constituere affirmant, illi *nondum* solido fundamento fulcita appareat" (p. 30).

As we have no intention of preventing our readers from obtaining the full benefit of Father Casacca's argument, we shall have a complete review of (not a reply to) this pamphlet in our next number. For although it is, as stated above, little more than a reproduction of P. Antonelli's argument, which Fr. Casacca did not consider sufficiently appreciated by our clergy, (wherefore, at his request, we published it with fourteen pages additional space to answer some very simple objections), still the subject is of sufficient importance to merit a review. Besides, there are some grave blunders in Father Casacca's argument which, since he has published them in pamphlet, need to be commented on. This will appear in our June issue, by the theologian who was prevented from answering the statements made by Father Casacca, so that complete justice may be done to the latter. It is not likely that P. Lehmkuhl will notice the summary way in which his view (which rests upon definite data and a long, practical experience) is dealt with by Father Casacca, who says "*Opinio Revdi. P. Lehmkuhl est falsa et rejicienda.*" P. Lehmkuhl had said that the opinion of Father Casacca was the opinion defended by P. Antonelli, and that P. Antonelli might be *theoretically* right, but *practically* his view could not be sustained.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

1. Grammars and Dictionaries.—All friends of New Testament study will be glad to learn that Professor Blass, of Halle, has been able to publish a second edition of his *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*[1] within six years after its first appearance. No doubt, the reader is acquainted with the first edition of the work, at least in its English translation published by Macmillan.[2] The author shows throughout that he has not remained stationary during the course of the last six years. The changes and additions he introduces are considerable enough to increase the size of the volume. Some of his views will certainly provoke discussion. Professor Blass' great antagonist, Prof. A. Deissmann, of Heidelberg, has already expressed his intention of examining the new edition thoroughly in the pages of the *Berlin. philolog. Wochenschrift.*[3]—No Hebrew Grammar is so well known and so extensively quoted in exegetical literature as that of Gesenius. Edition after edition has been published, and now we have reached the twenty-seventh.[4] In this latest edition the paradigms and indices are printed separately, so as to allow of more convenient handling. The inner top-margin gives the page number, while the figures on the outer margin refer to the paragraphs. On p. vi of the Introduction is given a list of the sections amplified or changed, newly added, or omitted. A detailed review of the new edition has been contributed by Prof. Max L. Margolis to *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.*[5]—Professor Strack has issued a third edition of his Aramaic Grammar.[6] He has utilized the avail-

[1] Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1902, 8vo, pp. xii—348.

[2] New York, 1898, pp. ix—340.

[3] Cf. *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung*, January 2, 1903, 211 f.

[4] Wilhelm Gesenius' *Hebräische Grammatik.* Völlig umgearbeitet von E. Kautsch; F. C. W. Vogel, Leipzig, 1902, pp. xii—591.

[5] April, 1903, pp. 159–170.

[6] *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, mit den nach Handschriften berichtigten Texten und einem Wörterbuch; Leipzig, 1901, 8vo, pp. 40 und 60.

able new manuscript material, and he gives the Aramaic text, partly with Babylonian vocalization, in full. Though every experienced teacher has his own peculiar ways and methods of dividing and arranging the subject-matter of the class, we believe that all will agree in acknowledging the practical utility of the glossary which Professor Strack has added to the new edition of his Grammar.—It is now about eight years ago since Professor Erman published his Egyptian Grammar in the series *Porta Linguarum Orientalium.* The sale of the book has been large enough to render a second edition necessary.[7] In this new edition the grammatical forms, especially in the verb, the participles, and the relative form, have been classified and explained according to the results of the latest researches. The reader will find more lengthy notices of the work in the *Deutsche Litteratur Zeitung*[8] and *The Expository Times.*[9]—Dr. Alexander Dedekind has worked out a grammatical sketch of the Old-Egyptian languages, and illustrated the same by a number of paradigms and extracts from the most important hieroglyphic texts.[10] The reader will find the author's introduction on the grouping of languages in general a most interesting study.—Perhaps it may not be out of place to notice here the *Elementary Modern Armenian Grammar*, by Baron Kevork H. Gulian, of the Anatolia College, Merzifoun. The author follows the Gaspey-Otto-Sauer system for the study of modern languages. We believe the method would be improved if the translation and vocabulary were given side by side with the original in the exercises at the end. Excellent specimens of Armenian literature have been selected to enable the student to master the chief difficulties of the language with the least expenditure of labor. The book has been published simultaneously in London, New York, and Heidelberg.[11]—We may mention here, too, Mr. L. W. King's *Assyrian Language.*[12] The author is so well known on account of his

[7] *Aegyptische Grammatik* mit Schrifttafel, Litteratur, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichniss ; zweite gänzlich umgearbeitete Auflage ; Reuther & Reichard, Berlin, 1902, pp. xiii—238.

[8] January 24, 1903, 208 ff.

[9] February, 1903, p. 212 f.

[10] *Aegyptologische Untersuchungen*, Vienna, 1902, 8vo, pp. vii—232.

[11] 1902, pp. viii—196.

[12] *Easy Lessons in the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, London, 1901. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., pp. xvi—220.

First Steps in Assyrian, published in 1898, that he needs no further commendation.

It was in 1897 that Dr. Gustaf H. Dalman published the first part of his Aramaic Lexicon, and it was fully four years later before the second part of the book appeared.[13] It appears that the work is intended primarily as a handbook for students to whom the large works of Levy and Jastrow are inaccessible. But we are afraid that its purely alphabetical arrangement of words, its omission of a considerable part of the vocabulary, and its peculiar vocalization of certain forms will prove a considerable drawback to its usefulness. A detailed criticism of both parts may be found in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* for October, 1898, and October, 1902.[14]—Dr. Ernst Harder, who published an Arabic Grammar several years ago, has now added a very useful German-Arabic Dictionary.[15] Based on the Arabic written language the work chiefly serves practical purposes. It gives about three times as many items as the well-known dictionary of Wahrmund. Plural, imperfect, and infinitive forms are carefully indicated, and the various contractions of the Arabic verbs are briefly added.—Dr. Muss Arnolt's *Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language* is now nearing its completion. While we fully realize the fact that a final Assyrian dictionary is impossible at the present stage of knowledge of Assyrian, we believe that Dr. Arnolt's work bids fair to supersede to a large extent the pretentious *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* of Professor Delitzsch. The latter has spoiled his book by what may be called personal animosity, suppressing references to Assyriological works other than those produced by his own band of students. Such an unscientific method of proceeding cannot compete with the fair and broad-minded statement of bibliographical notices prevalent in Dr. Muss-Arnolt's Dictionary.

After the appearance of the two great Biblical Dictionaries written in English, German readers interested in Biblical study

[13] *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud, und Midrasch*, mit Vokalisation der targumischen Wörter nach südarabischen Handschriften und besonderer Bezeichnung des Wortschatzes des Onkelostargum ; Teil II ; Frankfurt a. M., J. Kauffmann, pp. iv—181–447.

[14] Vol. xv, p. 57 ff; vol. xix, p. 61 ff.

[15] *Deutsch-Arabisches Handwörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1903, 8vo, pp. viii –804.

found themselves at a considerable disadvantage. It was with a view of remedying this evil that Professor H. Guthe, of Leipzig, aided by the coöperation of such men as Beer, Holtzmann, Kautzsch, Siegfried, Socin, Wiedemann, and Zimmern, undertook to edit his *Kurzes Bibelwörterbuch.*[16] It professes to be the organ of no sect or party, but to be a fair summary of all that is known of the many subjects with which the Scriptures deal. Some of its abbreviations are at first perplexing, and they require thought even on the part of the veteran reader. According to the plan, subjects on Biblical theology are excluded from the book ; though one knows this, one feels tempted to look for some of the better known headings involving the forbidden subject, such as " Son of man." The work contains also four chronological tables, two maps, and two hundred and fifteen excellent illustrations.—Since our last notice of *The Jewish Encyclopædia,*[17] the second and third volumes have appeared. They follow the same method with which we became acquainted in the first volume, and they are a real storehouse of erudition on topics which are both important and curious enough to merit our attention. Probably it is almost impossible to secure perfect consistency in a work that numbers as many contributors as the *Encyclopædia ;* it would, therefore, be unfair to take exception to occasional inconsistencies. But it appears to us that the work would have been improved by being less Jewish than it is, at least in some questions. Christian readers will not be attracted by seeing St. Paul heading the list of Jewish apostates,[18] and Catholics do not like to hear St. Pius called the " tyrannical pope Pius V." [19] The picture of the Church, as presented on p. 14, Vol. II, is open to improvement, and the motives ascribed to Christian converts from Judaism [20] are often objectionable. Scholastic theologians and philosophers will be astonished to hear that St. Thomas " betrays a profound knowledge, not only of the writings of Avicebron, . . . but of all Jewish philosophical works then existing. . . . Thus he gives

[16] Tübingen, 1903, J. C. B. Mohr, 8vo, pp. xxviii—768.

[17] Funk & Wagnalls, New York and London.

[18] Vol. ii, p. 13.

[19] Vol. ii, p. 16.

[20] Article " Apostates."

five proofs of the existence of God, three of which are directly taken from Jewish philosophers." We must confess that after reading the foregoing statement we turned to the article "Aristotle" in order to see whether the Greek sage, too, derived his philosophy from Jewish masters. And sure enough, Aristotle did come in contact with a learned Jew, according to the article modestly entitled "Aristotle in Jewish Legend." Another article that excited our curiosity is entitled "Asceticism." The writer believes that "Judaism is of a temper which is fatal to asceticism." How then are we to explain the fasting practised by the Jews? "Oriental fasting," we are told in all sobriety, "is merely a preparation for the eating of the sacrificial meal." It must be placed on the same level with the "rabbinical injunction, not to eat too late a meal on the eve of the Sabbath-day, so as to enjoy all the more that of the Sabbath."—We do not claim that everything done or written by Christians is necessarily perfect; but we believe that our Catholic and Protestant Dictionaries are far more reliable on their respective topics than the *Jewish Encyclopædia.*

2. Hebrew Metre.—Everything connected with the metrical structure and strophic nature of Hebrew poetry appears to be so unsatisfactory that any new attempt to solve the riddle must be prepared to encounter an almost insurmountable array of scepticism on the part of the readers. The writers who are not discouraged by this difficulty either possess more than ordinary courage or are inspired by a deeper than a merely hypothetic knowledge. Men like Bickell, Gietman, Müller, Perles, Zenner, Briggs, have urged their respective views on the public without producing full conviction. It may be supposed that a number of other men and books will have to be added to the list of human errors before the problem of Hebrew poetry can be considered as fairly settled. Of late, Mr. E. Sievers has stimulated the interest in this line of investigation by publishing his *Studies in Hebrew Metre.*[21] In the first part of this work the author had laid down his principles; in the second he gives the metrical examples promised in the first. The author finds it rather hard to remain perfectly consistent throughout, especially with regard to the lines that are metrically correct

[21] *Metrische Studien.* I. Studien zur Hebräischen Metrik. Zweiter Teil: Textproben; Leipzig, 1901, B. G. Teubner; pp. iv—404–599.

but unintelligible, with regard to the indication of independent parts of chapters, and with regard to the Masoretic tradition of the accent. The Hebrew text of the examples is printed on one page, its transliteration on the opposite page, and in the margin the corresponding rhythmical structure. The author freely acknowledges that certain questions connected with his subject need further investigation.—Mr. Hubert Grimme may be known to some of our readers as the author of essays bearing on the metrical principles of Hebrew poetry. These same principles are again inculcated by the writer in his *Metrical Problems of the Psalter*.[22] Selah and the refrain are represented as the only sure criteria of the strophic structure in the Psalter; Paseq-Legarmeh is regarded as a sign of text-variants. The author believes that no satisfactory solution of the metrical problem of the Psalms can be reached until the whole mass of Semitic metrical forms has been examined, the tonic laws of the primitive Semitic tongue have been determined, and the relation of Hebrew metre to that of other Semitic peoples has been finally settled. Variation of metre within the limits of the same Psalm, as a general rule, is repudiated. The author may not prove his thesis, but he offers us a mass of interesting suggestions.—Professor Kautzsch has published a series of six lectures on the poetry and the poetical books of the Old Testament.[23] It was reported last year that the latest attraction in Berlin consisted in the delivery of certain portions of the Old Testament, both prose and poetry. It seems to be necessary to re-discover our old treasures in order to make us appreciate them. Thus it comes to pass that a demand for the Old Testament has been re-awakened; Kautzsch's lectures endeavor to supply this demand. The author considers: (1) the nature and form of Hebrew poetry; (2) the various kinds of Hebrew poetry; (3) specimens of poetry among the ancient Hebrews as extant in the Old Testament; (4) collections of songs in Israel; (5) the various poetical books of the Old Testament. The writer's observations concerning the Book of Job are of especial importance; he seems to have successfully overthrown Duhm's

[22] *Psalmenprobleme:* Untersuchungen über Metrik, Strophik und Paseq des Psalmenbuches. Freiburg, 1902, Universitätsbuchhandlung, pp. viii—204.

[23] *Die Poesie und die poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen, 1902, J. C. B. Mohr, 8vo, pp. vii—109.

hypothesis that the prologue and the epilogue of that book are parts of an older "Volksbuch" which the poet used as a framework for his poem.—Professor Haupt has published in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*[24] an essay on the poetic form of the first Psalm, read before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, New York, December 31, 1902. The author gives a number of valuable suggestions, but one cannot help being amused at his cocksureness. He allows the "ipse dixit" of the class-room to affect his lecture. If we adopt the writer's textual emendations, the first Psalm is a poem of three stanzas, each stanza consisting of five lines with two beats in each hemistich.—Dr. Julius Ley deals with the poetic form of the Book of Job in his new German translation of the same.[25]

3. The Virgin Birth of Our Lord.—The leading article of the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* for April treats of the attitude of modern Protestants towards the virginity of our Blessed Lady. It sums up the literature on the subject which appeared before the last quarter of the year 1902, but does not touch upon a controversy that has developed during the course of the last few months. General surprise and even horror were expressed by the English churchmen and laymen at some reported utterances of the Dean of Ripon at a meeting of the Churchmen's Union on October 29th, regarding the birth of Christ of a virgin, the resurrection and the ascension. The *Times* for October 31st reported the Dean's expressions, and after the discussion of this address had proceeded for some time, Dr. Fremantle considered that he had been misrepresented by the reporter, and sent a statement on the subject to the *Ripon Gazette*.[26] But this did not fully allay the storm. Hence the Bishop of Ripon sent a letter to the Dean in order to elicit an assurance that his innermost convictions did not contradict the profession of his ministry. Dr. Fremantle expressed his belief in "Christ as God manifest in the flesh," and in another letter he professed his conviction that Christ was born of a virgin.

[24] April, 1903, pp. 129–148.

[25] *Das Buch Hiob nach seinem Inhalt*, etc.; Halle, 1902, 8vo, pp. v—153.

[26] *Cf.* Walter R. Cassels' article in *The Nineteenth Century*, January, 1903, p. 26 ff.

Whatever may be the meaning of Dr. Fremantle's expressions addressed to the Bishop of Ripon, the Dean has not succeeded in his endeavors to explain his previous statements satisfactorily. He has been the occasion of the present condition of controversy in which "the virgin birth of our Lord is the problem of problems."[27] *The Expository Times* considers the question in its "Notes of Recent Exposition," in both its February and March numbers. In the same issues of the magazine Dr. H. B. Swete publishes an article on "The Two Greatest Miracles of the Gospel History,"[28] and Dr. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester, another article on "The Incarnation,"[29] in which the so-called problem of the virgin birth plays a prominent part. The same subject is discussed in a paper read last October by the President of Queen's College in Cambridge before an audience at Sion College, London.[30]

The main difficulties raised against the virgin birth of our Lord may be reduced to the following: (1) it is inherently improbable; (2) it is not found in the primitive gospel; (3) it is not found in ecclesiastical tradition independently of the gospels; (4) pagan mythologies too have their virgin births.

But there is a great deal of subjective evidence in all these reasons. (1) It appears to us inherently more improbable that God should effect the stupendous mystery of the Incarnation without the virgin birth than with it. (2) It is false that the primitive gospel did not know of the virgin birth. St. Mark and St. John do not mention the virgin birth, because their gospels practically begin with the public life of our Lord. The two evangelists who treat of the infancy of Christ give also the mystery of the virgin birth. And since St. Matthew and St. Luke are mutually independent witnesses, their agreement on this point amounts to doubly attested evidence. (3) Ecclesiastical tradition contains the mystery of the virgin birth much more clearly than other articles of faith which are not questioned. (4) The phantastic birth of certain heroes in pagan mythology only shows that the human

[27] Cf. *The Expository Times*, February, 1903, p. 199.

[28] P. 214 ff.

[29] P. 283 ff.

[30] Professor Chase, *The Supernatural Element in our Lord's Earthly Life in Relation to Historical Methods of Study;* Macmillan, 1903.

mind considers it inherently probable that such extraordinary beings should be distinguished from common mortals even from their very entrance into life. In the case of Jesus Christ, this antecedent probability of his virgin birth is amply attested by incontrovertible historic evidence.[31]

PHILOSOPHY.

The Oldest Psychology. — The newest book on the oldest Psychology is Professor Hammond's rendition of Aristotle's *De Anima* and the *Parva Naturalia*.[1]

To one who has camped for a season in the thickets of the *New Psychology*, or hunted for a time in its jungles, beating his way through its brambles, the brakes of psychoses-complexus and the rest, what a sense of relief there is at getting out into the open, unto the ample plain stretching out in the land of the Stagyrite. Nowhere else in the world of Philosophy, unless it be in the broader fields cultivated by the Scholastic clan, does one enjoy such roominess, such liberty, so full a play of eye and lung. Take, for instance, the opening paragraph in the *De Anima*. "We regard knowledge as a good and precious thing, but we esteem one sort of knowledge more highly than another, either because of its exactness[2] or because it is concerned with better and more admirable objects; for both these reasons we should rightly assign the investigation of the *soul* to the first rank. Further, it is supposed that a knowledge of the *soul* has an important bearing on all truth, and particularly on that of the natural world. For the *soul* is, as it were, the genetic principle in living things." The Philosopher proceeds to indicate the aim of the treatise at hand, viz.: "To investigate and ascertain the *essential nature of the soul;* secondly, to discover those *properties* which attach to it as *accidents*. Certain of the latter are supposed to be

[31] Cf. *The Expositor*, March, 1903, pp. 198–207.

[1] London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co.

[2] The original here is difficult to render. Professor Hammond, whose translations we otherwise follow, expresses it thus: "Because of the acumen required for its discovery."

conditions peculiar to *the soul's own nature*, and others are thought to be effects produced in living beings by the soul's agency."

Notice now how this lofty viewpoint takes on lines beneath the field-glass of Silvester Maurus.[3] The *dignity* of the science of *the soul* may be gathered both from the *general nature of science* and from the *special character of this science*. From the *general* nature of science: all science and knowledge of things is *good* and *honorable*, inasmuch as it is desirable for its own sake; on this account, then, will the science and knowledge of the *soul* be good and honorable. From the *special* character of *Psychical* science: for, though all sciences are *good* and *honorable*, some are more so than others, either because some are more *certain* or because they relate to *more excellent objects*. Now, the science of the *soul* contemplates the most perfect and noble of all "natural forms," and affords the highest certitude, since of all natural forms none is more manifest in itself, its states and functions, than the soul; therefore is the science of the *soul* the *best* and the *most honorable* amongst all natural and mathematical sciences, yielding in this to metaphysics alone.

The *utility* of the science of *soul* is plain from this—that a knowledge of *soul* avails to the investigating of all other truths, those as well which concern metaphysics and morals as those which relate to physics.

Useful is it for a knowledge of *metaphysical* truth, since from knowledge of our own intellect do we rise to the contemplation of pure intelligences. Useful, too, it is for the knowing of *moral* truths, because moral virtues are powers that perfect the faculties of *the soul* and place due measure on the passions; to know the moral virtues, then, must we know the powers and passions of *the soul*. Useful no less is it for knowledge of truths *physical* and *natural*, because *soul* being the formal principle and the constitutive form of all animals and plants, the most and the chiefest of natural bodies are unknowable unless *the soul* be known. In working out this science it behooveth to follow this order: First, to treat of the *substance* of soul; secondly, of its *accidents* or states, whereof some belong to *soul alone* and affect not the body; others to the body also, though in virtue of the *soul*.

[3] *Brevis Paraphrasis*, p. 3.

Such is the broad outlook of the Stagyrite and his scholastic followers. *Soul* is *substance;* it has its peculiar *essential attributes* and *properties.* It is the business of psychical science to investigate and describe these attributes and properties, or as Sir John Davies rhymes it in his quaint old poem:

> The *soule a substance* and a *spirit* is,
> Which God Himselfe doth in the body make;
> Which makes *Man;* for every man from this,
> The nature of a Man and name doth take,
>
> And though this spirit be to the body knit,
> As an apt meane her powers to exercise;
> Which are *life, motion, sense* and *will* and *wit,*
> Yet she *survives,* although the body dies.[4]

Call this programme of the old psychology *naïf,* if you wish; it is certainly the standpoint of common sense; nor is it any discredit to the Aristotelian that he deems it not "unscientific" to heed the voice of rational instinct; to build on nature rather than blast its bed-rock in the attempt to find a solid basis for theory. The perception of *soul* as a *substantial principle* of psychical operation as a single permanent source of conscious activity, is an intuition of consciousness, or at least an internal fact revealed by the most obvious reflective analysis, and may therefore with ample justification be made the *starting-point* of psychology. Aristotle, however, does not take advantage of this readily-given fact of consciousness. He was confronted with the adverse views of his predecessors, and is at pains to describe them in the second and third chapters of his First Book *On the Soul.*

> One thinks the Soule is *aire;* another *fire;*
> Another *blood,* diffus'd about the heart;
> Another saith, the *elements* conspire,
> And to her *essence* each doth give a part.
>
> *Musicians* thinke our Soules are harmonies,
> *Physicians* hold that they *complexions* bee;
> *Epicures* make them swarms of *atomies,*
> Which do by chance into our bodies flee.

[4] *Nosce Teipsum.* By Sir John Davies. Edited by the Rev. A. Grosart. London, 1876.

Some thinke one general Soule fils every brain,
As the bright *sunne* sheds light in every Starre;
And others think the name of *Soul* is vain,
And that we only well-mixt bodies are.
. . . . . .
In judgment of her substance thus they vary;—

This quaintly rhythmical summary of the philosophical speculations which confronted Aristotle, needs but an alteration of its crude terminology into the technicalities of modern science to make it do duty as a synthesis of the materialistic monism prevalent in our own day.

It may be said that the importance and difficulty of psychological method were as patent to Aristotle as they are to a modern Weber or Wundt. He finds "no single and general method," be it "deductive proof or analysis or any other one procedure," adequate for his purpose. But deduction and induction, synthesis and analysis, observation and reasoning must be employed, and employed *conjointly*, for "not only does the knowledge of the *essential* nature of a thing seem to be helpful toward the understanding of the *accidental* nature and *properties* of *substances*, but conversely, the knowledge of accidental properties contributes largely to the understanding of what a thing *essentially* is. For when we are able to give an account of the accidental properties of things as we see them—either of all these properties or of most of them—then we are best able to speak also of their essential nature." It need hardly be said that notwithstanding all the immense labor and heated controversy over the problem of psychological method, especially during the past half century, the human mind has not advanced a single step beyond this principle formulated by the Stagyrite two thousand and more years ago. Neither have we discovered a new or a better, a safer or a more efficient method than the one that results directly from the application of this Aristotelian principle. And all this because the mind must be conditioned in its procedure by the fundamental law of its being. Bound up in its present state with the organism, it is necessarily dependent on the sensory apparatus for the matter of thought; the concrete individual facts must be presented to it through the senses. Hence, in its initial method of arriving at truth, it needs must be *inductive* and

analytic. On the other hand, being no less essentially the "form of the body," the vivifying, actuating principle of the organism, as Aristotle defines it, it abstracts and universalizes, judges, reasons. Its method, therefore, must with no less necessity be likewise *synthetic* and *deductive.*

Neither method, however, singly followed, can beget *science. Analysis* alone will give *matter. Synthesis* alone will give *form,* principles, plan. Both must unite to give structure, systematized knowledge, insight into what things are and how and why they behave as they do,—*cognitio certa rerum per causas.* That Aristotle employed this dual method no one can truthfully deny who has carefully perused the *De Anima.* He approaches the study of the human soul, through the study of life in general. Psychology with him is biology, a department of physical science. Phenomena, external and internal, sensile and mental, lead him to a knowledge of whatever he could learn as to the nature of the life principle in plant, in animal, in man; but comparison and reasoning he found no less necessary to reveal the special attributes and properties of the various grades or species of life. That both he and his followers for twenty centuries did not pursue the investigation of the external or sensile phenomena sufficiently far; that they were mistaken in some of their interpretations thereof; in other words, that the analytical side of the perpatetic psychology was insufficiently developed, will be readily admitted. The paucity of instruments of research and experimentation—they had no psychological laboratories—and the backward state of the physical sciences will account for this deficiency. On the other hand, whilst the use of the experimental method in recent times has resulted in a fuller knowledge of the phenomena and laws of life, its exaggerated use—its abuse—has taken the heart out of psychology and left us a soulless science of soul. A competent witness to the present status of psychology, a witness unprejudiced because fiercely inimical to the old psychology and a strenuous advocate of *une psychologie sans âme,* will be found in a recent notable textbook.

The Newest Psychology.—The latest book of note in English on this subject is Gustav Spiller's *The Mind of Man.*[4]

[4] London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Company.

In view of the fact that recent psychology is supposed to have been completely divorced from philosophy, to have utterly repudiated the leading-strings of the maternal *wisdom*, and become an independent *natural science*, the reader may be surprised to read that, in Mr. Spiller's opinion, "the amazing backwardness of psychology is principally due to its having been almost exclusively cultivated by philosophers or those philosophically inclined, instead of by men of science."

The author ventures the hope that the point of view from which he has written will commend itself to the lovers of science. He has "attempted to walk the straight and narrow path," and has "consequently declined to accommodate his conclusions to any party." He feels that his work "will have fulfilled its author's purpose if it accentuates the need of, and assists in establishing, a psychology of a strictly scientific character," and uncontrolled by philosophical speculation. Psychology is to have its revenge on the heretofore dominating spirit of philosophy. Science of mind, the author believes, "must revolutionize the whole of philosophy. By determining the nature of mental processes and the nature of mind, it will set at rest once for all those discussions which have raged around a unitary conception of the universe." Physical science and mental science, Mr. Spiller foretells, "will then no more form two independent and hostile camps, and speculative metaphysics will cease to exist, handing over its many interesting problems to science."

This revolutionment of philosophy and its absorption by "science" are fixed, however, for no early date, at least if one may adjust one's prophetic outlook from the present status of psychology as described by the author. "Of late," he says, "it has almost become the fashion to assume that the foundations of psychology are firmly laid, and that all that remains is to work out problems of secondary importance. It is argued that we have now only to apply the knowledge which has been gained and to occupy ourselves with an exhaustive examination of the psychology of the child, of races, of animals, etc. If this be so, the reader should find in this book a restatement, a dogmatic exposition of the established body of psychological conclusions. Should he expect that, he will be disappointed." According to the

author's interpretation of the data, "the ship of psychology is still in mid-ocean, still at the mercy of storms of doubt, still without chart or compass, and still far from port." He maintains not only "that the elementary principles of psychology have still to be established;" but he believes also "that from the scientific point of view no serious attempt has yet been made in that direction."

Mr. Spiller is quite alive to the gravity of this charge. "When a literature so voluminous as is that of psychology, when Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Germans are vying with each other in the production of learned treatises, it seems almost madness to suggest that the scheme of operations is strategically suicidal and that nothing but a retreat to the base and a new plan of campaign can secure success." Such, nevertheless, is his contention, and a grave and an unpleasant task it needs must be to assume its defence, and "to announce to others that the news of victory which all had greeted with joy is void of truth." Nevertheless, while destructive criticism may give rise to bitter disappointment, "it must be endured," he holds, "for its beneficial effects." The criticism is brought to bear first upon the Associationalists. The principle of association of ideas was never brought under "scientific treatment," was never "scientifically tested." From the first to last, from Hobbes to Sully and James, "scarcely-veiled speculation has determined the opinion of English and American psychologists" in respect to the principle and laws of association.

Of Herbart and his school, Mr. Spiller has this to say: According to them "presentations hinder or facilitate others coming into the foreground of consciousness. The Herbartians possess an elaborate mechanism reminding one of pulleys, levers, crowbars, cranes and what not, for the transporting hither and thither of presentations. Of science there is not a grain. Like Hans Andersen's tailors, the presentations appear to be busily engaged but produce nothing. Such huge treatises as those of Volkmann, a follower of Herbart, and Lipps, a follower of Beneke, form the completest indictment of present-day psychological methods."

But if Associationism is "unscientific" in its procedure and unsatisfactory in its results, a rare instance of unscientific method is observed by the author in the modern treatment of habit.

"Locke tells us that the power or ability in man of doing any-

thing when it has been acquired by frequently doing the same thing is that idea which we name habit." The student of recent text-books will be familiar with the conception of Habit as a *pathway of discharge formed in the brain by which certain incoming currents ever after tend to escape*, or, if the habit is *highly complex*, as *concatenated discharges in the nerve-centres due to the presence there of systems of reflex paths, so organized as to wake each other up successfully*, and other such physiological analogies. "This hazarded conjecture utterly unsubstantiated has been the first and the last word of the psychologists on the subject. As any well-known work on physiology will show, our knowledge of brain processes is unspeakably inadequate to permit us to make such an assertion. When we come to psychology we find no other confirmation than popular rumor might lend; there is not even the faintest suspicion of scientific caution."

Attention, Mr. Spiller finds, "has been more seriously studied" and with "less complete failure." The subject, however, "is still buried in obscurity, for theories have so darkened the minds of students that the light of the most powerful intellects scarcely sheds a glimmer along the path. By means of almost superhuman effort a trifle was gained here and there, and these trifles tended more to bewilder than to encourage."

Hard as the author appears to be on *theoretical* psychology even when restricted to the mere phenomena of mind, he is scarcely less severe in his estimate of *quantitative* psychology or psycho-physics. After some account of the experimental methods in this direction, he goes on to say that he "welcomes the quantitative method as such. If it can best elucidate the problems of psychology it must take the first place. One does not know what it will accomplish in the future, but up to the present, after a generation of toil, its many solid achievements have scarcely touched the borders of psychology proper. It has thrown no light on our chief problems. It deals with borderland affairs which apparently yield no glimpse of the far interior." He discerns "two failings" in the psycho-physical literature. "It reveals a superstitious belief in the magic of figures." Judicious observation and chance experiment, he believes, "could settle with comparative ease many of the ques-

tions which demand mountainous labor from the figure school." Secondly, instruments, he thinks, would be better used after other methods have prepared the way. Psycho-physicists, he finds, "are now insisting that figures uninterpreted by the state of mind of the 'reagent' are not to be relied on. We are thus completing a circle. *First, men rushed to figures because introspection seemed unreliable ; and now self-observation is demanded to give a meaning to the figures.*" After reviewing what is practically the whole field of psycho-physics, the author's "misgivings as to its value have grown stronger than ever. The method seems fundamentally wrong. A problem is posited, reduced to its simplest form, and then rigorously tested." It appears to him "that the simplicity is in every instance non-existent. It is a hypothetical simplicity, a simplicity suggested by surface knowledge. The primary facts of a science," he cannot help thinking, "must be obtained by tentative and resourceful trials and are not obtainable by stiff laboratory experiments. Systematic introspection must therefore, ere long, be generally acknowledged as essential to psychologizing."

The reader may be surprised at seeing this appeal to introspection as a psychological method. From Hume to Compte, from Herbart to Sully and James, introspection has been either rejected or looked upon with marked suspicion amongst the psychologists. Mr. Spiller summons the witnesses for and against and finds "that the testimony, almost without exception, directly or by implication, against introspection is crushing." To it all he replies, "*retrospection is of necessity introspection, and if therefore introspection be impossible, our minds are absolute blanks.*"

It must not be inferred, however, from this advocacy of the introspective method that "the base" to which the author "sounds a retreat" is that of the "old psychology." Far from it. The introspection for which he pleads must be *experimental.* "The student must be prepared to learn that in *psychology every inquiry must be experimental.* Simple observation is only permissible when for peculiar reasons experiment is undesirable or out of the question. The normal procedure, the all but exceptional method, must include experiment." The author insists strongly on the necessity of systematic training in the art of psychologizing. Introspective observation and experimentation must be subjected

to rigid discipline and careful drill. This is urged by theory and illustrated by practical example on every page. The following paragraph indicates how the student should comport himself in the pursuit of this art: "I suggest the following experiments or observations, and must remark that repetition under varying circumstances is necessary and that notes should be taken at the time, of what is observed. Write mentally in characters of various sizes; so also employ mentally printed and sounded characters. Use lips as a vigorous speech, without making any sound, and also observe the various organs employed in speech. Picture to yourself squares, triangles, etc., of various sizes. Observe eye movements in seeing, also movements in walking, running, working, etc. Examine mentally form, detail, as many colors as possible, shades of color, relief, scenes, motion of eyes in watching moving objects. Hold steadily pencil, pencils, etc., in hand, behind the ear, etc., and note result. Recall various smells of things just smelt, lately smelt, and smelt long ago. Describe bodily feelings in sitting (in various positions), standing, walking, etc., and describe what you feel, passively and actively, of feet, legs, back, arm, head, teeth, tongue, separate fingers, etc. . . . Look at some pebbles, etc.; then see whether you can count them mentally. Hear with one ear, both ears, far and near, much and little, different kinds of sounds. Examine degrees of cold, warmth, touch, soft, hard, rough, smooth, pushing, pulling, effort."

After perusing these instructions and yet more if he reduce them to practice, the reader will be in a position to appreciate what was said in the beginning of this paper about the sense of relief one feels in getting out of the jungle of recent psychology into the open plains of Aristotelianism. We would not, indeed, have this remark interpreted as a misappreciation of the experimental side of psychology. We get precious woods, to say nothing of rare birds and wonderful beasts, from the jungle. We may hope for some useful knowledge from out the tangle of recent psychology. Luscious berries and bright flowers grow on brambles. The brake of psychical experimentation may yield us much that is sapid and attractive. The beast and serpent of the forest, the sting and tear of the briar we may suffer in compensation for the profitable and wholesome.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1803. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Edited and annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with historical introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne. With Maps, portraits and other illustrations. Vol. I—1493-1529. Pp. 357. Vol. II—1521-1569. Pp. 335. Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Company. MCMIII.

If there is an historical work that is likely to fulfil its mission for good in the immediate future it is this magnificent history of the Philippine Islands, to which we have already adverted in a recent number of this magazine. It is true that the immense and painstaking research of the collaborators and the well-equipped editors of this work which promises some fifty volumes, was not, as Mr. Bourne in his Historical Introduction to the first volume says, "to discuss the Philippine question of to-day, nor Philippine life during the last half century, nor will it give a short history of the Islands since the Conquest," but the object is rather to furnish us with a survey of Philippine life and culture under the old régime which must not only prove of deep and singular interest to the historian, but is well calculated to furnish the political economist of the United States with most valuable data of a practical nature; and no one can ignore how serious an element this is for our statesmen in their dealings with a population and with racial conditions very different from those to which we have been accustomed during the last century of our history.

"The entrance of the United States of America into the arena of world-politics, the introduction of American influence into Oriental affairs, and the establishment of American authority in the Philippine archipelago, all render the history of those islands and their numerous peoples a topic of engrossing interest and importance to the reading public, and especially to scholars, historians and statesmen." Nor is

there any danger that the facts of history here brought forth will suffer from the bias of the editors; for, unlike those who see truth and its useful service only from the standpoint of their individuality or in the light of traditional prejudice, they have adopted a just and liberal method of exposition by reproducing (mainly in English translation) such contemporaneous documents as constitute the best original sources of Philippine history. Beginning with the year 1493, when Pope Alexander VI marked the line of dominion in the New World between the Spanish and Portuguese discoverers and colonizers, the history of its people inhabiting the archipelago is traced through a period of more than three centuries. Nor is this history simply a collection of Spanish documents upon the subject which it treats. Every possible source of collateral information likely to give true light to the purpose and scope of these documents has been probed. The fact that the editors acknowledge publicly their debt not only to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Spanish Legation, the Hon. Bellamy Storer, late U. S. Minister to Spain, and other persons of authority in civil life, but also to the learned Augustinian, Dr. Thomas C. Middleton, of Villanova, the Rev. Thomas Sherman, S.J., the Rev. John Wynne, S.J., the Rev. Ubaldus Pandolfi, of the Franciscan Fathers, Bishop Horstman of Cleveland, Bishop Messmer of Green Bay, and other learned Catholic priests, is a guarantee of the good faith which animated the able scholars engaged upon this great work.

The Introduction covering about 70 pages is itself a masterpiece of judicial historical study. It points out the purpose of the work, its methods, and suggests the likely results to which its proper use as an authentic history of the Philippines will lead. The first volume is taken up mainly with the Documents regarding the Line of Demarcation—the two Papal Bulls entitled *Inter Caetera* and *Eximiae* and their subsequent extension; the treaties between Fernando V. and João II; The life and voyage of Fernão de Magalhães, with the incidents that connect these facts.

In the second volume we have the details of Garcia de Loaisa's expedition in 1525, the voyage of Alvaro de Saavedra, the Campaigns of Ruy de Villalobos and of Miguel Lopez de Legazpi. Then follows the Warrant of the Augustinian authorities in Mexico establishing a branch of their Order in the Philippines, the beneficial results of which are in marked contrast with the purely military influence of the government representatives.

The bibliographical data at the end of each volume are numerous

and detailed and add very materially to the value of a work which is precious on many other accounts. It is needless to say that the letterpress and bookmaking are admirable, as are also the illustrations. Only one thousand copies have been printed, to be disposed of to subscribers.

ARISTOTLE'S PSYCHOLOGY. A TREATISE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF LIFE. (De Anima and Parva Naturalia.) Translated with Introduction and Notes by William Alexander Hammond, M.A., Ph.D. London: Swan, Sonnenschein Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. xxxvi—339.

THE MIND OF MAN. A Text-Book of Psychology. By Gustav Spiller. London: Swan, Sonnenschein Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 552.

PSYCHOLOGY. Normal and Morbid. By Charles A. Mercier, M.B., M.R.C.P., F.R.C.S. London: Swan, Sonnenschein Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. 518.

Professor Hammond deserves the gratitude of students of philosophy and psychology for his excellent translation of the above-mentioned works of Aristotle. The *Parva Naturalia* have been thus far practically inaccessible in English, and the *De Anima* has heretofore received, we believe, no such sympathetic and fair rendering. In one handy and attractive volume the student has now at command the whole of Aristotle's psychology. Those who are acquainted with the *Philosopher's* crabbed Greek, the puzzling lacunæ and breviloquence of treatises which seem to be composed of jottings intended as lecture notes, will measure the difficulty of the translator's task, and appreciate the smoothness and clarity of Professor Hammond's version. The fairly elaborate introduction affords a comprehensive survey of the Aristotelian psychology and reflects, as do also the annotations—which, though brief, are practical and suggestive—an unusually clear insight into the mind of the Stagyrite. Aristotle's psychology has much more than a historical significance as a constituent in the development of philosophy. Its fundamental doctrine, that the soul is the root-principle of all vital activity in the organism—which, however, in the higher energies of thought and volition it transcends—is the only basis for a consistent system of mental science; and there are not wanting encouraging signs that recent biologists and psychologists are coming to realize the scientific importance of this doctrine. It is to be hoped that the present translation will exert an influence toward a larger return to a sound philosophy of mind.

Mr. Spiller's *The Mind of Man*, it need hardly be said after the observations made elsewhere in this number (p. 594), shows no Aristotelian coloring. The *Philosopher's* name appears thrice incidentally on its pages, but his philosophical viewpoint is antipodal to that of Mr. Spiller. The latter writer has no respect for substances and accidents, matter and form, or for rational, a *priori*, or deductive methods in psychology. Mind is for him a tissue of complex states and these are to be explained by analytical processes only. From this position the Aristotelian psychologist must of course utterly dissent. On the other hand Mr. Spiller's book is not without commendable features. It is first of all a remarkable piece of criticism. The author shows himself familiar with almost every work of importance on modern psychology and is penetrating and, we believe, just in his judgments on their theories. In the second place he manifests a truly wonderful analytical insight into psychical phenomena. The details which he is liable to discern in a state of consciousness, which to the average reflective mind would seem comparatively simple, are really astonishing. The passion for distinction popularly supposed to have been the main endowment of mediæval *Doctor Subtilissimus* is feeble in comparison with that displayed in the present work. Doubtless this is all very important, and necessary, in a way, if not essential, to science. And yet we cannot help thinking that the author has carried it beyond the limits compatible with the function of his work as a text-book.

First of all there are comparatively few youth capable of assimilating the subtle analyses which crowd its every page; and secondly those who are capable will ere long grow weary of the strain demanded of them and are likely to give it all up. The adjustment of the work to text-book purposes is, to say the least, doubtful. This does not mean, however, that for the advanced student and more especially for the professor the work may not prove useful and stimulating.

Quite different in scope and method from the foregoing is Mercier's *Psychology, Normal and Morbid.* The former work aims at the minutest decomposition of consciousness, in the interests of descriptive science solely, and is rigidly analytic in its procedure. The latter takes a broader view of mental activity, is mainly practical in its purpose and mingles its method considerably with synthesis and theory.

Dr. Mercier's book has grown out of the practical needs of the professional alienist. One who has to deal habitually with the abnormal conditions of mind stands in need of a psychology that shall treat normal functioning with special reference to its disorders; some-

what as general medical physiology bears a pertinent relation to pathology. A work of this character has hitherto not existed. The present author has sought to supply the demand. Aiming at this special requirement he has brought into the field of psychology a number of subjects which otherwise would fall to the departments of logic and epistemology. Thus not a little of the work is taken up with such topics as the syllogism, various forms of inference, certainty, probability, credibility, and the like. These, however, are discussed in connection with their abnormalities. Hence we find such matters as faults of reasoning, of inference, of belief, of volition, of memory, of pleasure and pain, and the like, treated at some length.

Whilst a knowledge of normal conditions is necessary for a knowledge of the abnormal, the converse is proportionally true. The present work, coming from an eminent physician who writes with the authority which practical experience adds to theory, has a value for the student of general psychology as well as for the specialist, a value which, so far as the present reviewer has observed, seems to consist in the wealth of concrete illustration and example which is here enmassed and skilfully utilized. In estimating the theoretical side of the work one has constantly to keep in mind its particular adaptation. This relationship may account for, if it does not justify, an occasional lack of precision or of adequate analysis. Thus, for instance, in the treatment of religious faith the supernatural factor is entirely ignored (p. 235), whilst throughout the chapter on credibility (210–244) the distinction between *authority* as an *objective motive* and the *psychological preparedness* for its influence on *assent*, as well as the nature of that assent and its *subjective environment* and *effects*, are not a little confused, as may be seen in so loose a statement as the following: "Faith is authority. That is to say, it is that factor in a testified relation which is due to the Authority of the witness, or more precisely, it *is* the Authority ascribed to the witness" (p. 235). The emphasis is here laid by the author on *is*. Authority *is* Faith. Now Faith (as an act) is a mental assent, a judgment, therefore a psychical state of the believer's mind. Authority, on the other hand, is knowledge and veracity in the witness, a mental and a moral condition, a psychical state of the narrator. Are we to infer that a psychical state in one mind *is* a psychical state in another mind? A subject also in which one discerns no little confusion in the author's treatment is that of volition. *Attention* and *willing* he declares to be identical. Willing is intensified attention, and attention is diminished willing. The confusion here permeates

modern psychology generally and results from its rejection of the philosophical distinction between intellect and will, and this in turn proceeds from its lack of a fixed objective criterion whereby to discriminate mental acts and states. The old Aristotelian axioms: *Acts are determined and specified by their corresponding objects or termini;* and, *Faculties are specified by their corresponding acts*, would have saved the author from confounding *attention* with *volition*. Attention is essentially a *cognitive* act; in its highest form, an *intellectual* act; volition is essentially an act of the *will*, a "faculty" specifically distinct from the intellect, as is evidenced by the peculiar character of the "formal object" at which its operation terminates. The act of attention may be *commanded*, though it cannot be *elicited* by the will; just as the act of seeing, hearing, etc., may be commanded but not elicited by the will. And it were just as logical or illogical to infer from the phrase "voluntary vision" that *vision* is *willing*, as it is for the author to infer, as he does, from the phrase "voluntary attention" that *attention* is *willing*.

COMPENDIUM JURIS REGULARIUM. Edidit P. Augustinus Bachofen, S.T.D. Benedictinus Abbatiae Immacul. Concept. Mo. U. S. A. Neo Eboraci, Cincinnati, Chicagiae: Benziger Bros. 1903.

Students of Canon Law and directors of Religious Communities in general will welcome this compend of the principles, laws, rights, and privileges which make up the religious state. The work does not pretend to discuss the separate institutes of Regulars, but confines itself to the study of the fundamentals upon which they are built and maintained. The nature of the Religious life, the conditions of their foundation, the requisites of admission, the obligations implied by the vows, the enclosure, the internal and external government, customs and privileges, and dispensations, are treated in a clear didactic style with reference to the more recent legislation on the subject. The final chapter is devoted to Religious Congregations as distinct from those which exact the solemn vows. The Appendix contains the full text of the important Decrees "Perpensis," and "Quemadmodum," the Constitution "Coaditae," and the Missionary Decree of 1901 "Quamvis Probe." The volume has a good Index and is well printed.

Literary Chat.

It is rather amusing at this time, when the question of "Reunion" is ripe on all sides, to come upon a work like Mr. Kingston Oliphant's recent volumes entitled *Rome and Reform* (Macmillan), in which the author elaborately demonstrates—not his prejudices, but—a total ignorance of the material with which he is to prove his thesis. He deals professedly with the history of the Popes; and his object is to improve on Ranke and Lord Macaulay, whom he specially mentions; for, quoth he, "within the last sixty years *many new works bearing upon my subject have been given to the world—works of which I have*, as I hope, *made good use.*" (Italics ours.) And how? By never mentioning Hergenröther, Pastor, Janssen, historians who stand at the head of the modern writers that have, by their special studies of the history of the Popes, revolutionized the old methods of historical research. Surely this is history for the Middle Ages, if not of the Middle Ages; although we doubt if even the much maligned men of that time would have thanked our Oxford scholar for his evidently good intention, since in the preface of these pretentious volumes he informs us that: "So far as I have any bias, it is toward Moderate Catholics, as distinguished from the Ultramontanes." Professor Oliphant might learn much regarding his special subject from the above-mentioned Ultramontanes. We advise him to get at once the two new volumes (V and VI) of the English translation of Johann Janssen, just off the press (Herder), where he will find something at least very helpful to clear up the subject of the Reformation with which he is largely concerned. If he will do this in a new edition, or perhaps a new work on his subject, the critical reader may pardon his bias against the Irish temperament where he has occasion to speak of it.

The Research Publishing Company (London—Philadelphia) has issued a metrical rendering of the *Tâo Teh King of the Lâo Tsze*, under the title of *The Light of China*. The little volume comprises in eighty-one chapters much ethical teaching which reflects the intellectual and moral culture of the Chinese in the sixth century before Christ. Here is a sample of the character and quality of the ancient lore with which Dr. Heysinger makes us acquainted:

"He who knows others is wise,
But he who knows himself is wiser still;
He who conquers others is strong,
But to conquer self needs greater strength and skill;
He who is content is truly rich;
He who is firm in action proves his real will;
He who holds fast to his post lives long,
But he who when he dies does not fail, he lives longer still!"

The Catholic Universe (Cleveland) has opened a list for the "Cardinal Newman Memorial Fund," and thereby shows its appreciation of the high ideal which

the great English convert, John Henry Newman, represents. The Rev. William McMahon, who has made his paper one of the healthiest Catholic weeklies in the land, and whose editorial activity is supported by a clever management, as the late Papal Jubilee number proves, is surely not in error when he believes the moral influence that comes from the popularizing of Newman's fame to be one of the most efficient levers toward that intellectual culture of which we hear so much and for which we do so little.

The popular life of Pope Leo XIII, by Monsignor O'Reilly, which is being widely advertised by the John C. Winston Company, is to be issued shortly in a two-volume edition. An analysis of some of the later Encyclicals, showing their practical bearing upon modern society, are to form the subject of the latter part of the work.

The April issue of the *Review of Catholic Pedagogy* contains a well-written paper on "Catholic School Work in the Diocese of Rochester," by Miss Katharine C. Conway. The article is remarkable inasmuch as it suggests what can be accomplished for Catholic education under consistent management with a clearly defined scholastic policy.

Mr. Moncure Conway, writing in *The Critic* on "Mary Magdalen," thinks that the legend which identifies the Mary of Bethany with the Mary in Simon's house, and with Mary Magdalen called "the sinner," grew out of a confusion of two or three distinct incidents in the New Testament. He finds that the old story is in reality without foundation and rather the effect of the emotions and aspirations of the human heart, which prompted a combination of the elements of sorrow for sin with grateful love for the Divine Master, whose words lead to repentance. We believe that the unprejudiced reader of St. Luke, setting aside all other evidence for or against the assumption of identity, will be satisfied that the Evangelist speaks of a repentant Mary (7 : 50) as a visitor in the house of the Pharisee, where she anoints the Lord's feet, and that this is Mary Magdalen, of whom he speaks immediately after (8 : 1–3) as one of the devout women who provided for the needs of the Master. Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great, and the Venerable Bede, as well as the Roman Liturgy, represent this Magdalen as the sister of Lazarus, Mary of Bethany; and this testimony of the Latin Church seems to outweigh that of Origen and Chrysostom, whose views have been embodied in the Greek Liturgy.

A series of four-page leaflets, called *Tracts for Deaf-Mutes*, is being issued by the Rev. Patrick M. Whelan (Mount Airy, Philadelphia). They are well written, concise, and practical, and would serve not only for the instruction of deaf-mutes, but for any class of persons difficult to instruct. The first folio was issued for Lent; another was ready for Easter; a third is announced for Pentecost.

Uuder the title *Nothing New*, the Paulist Father P. J. Murphy publishes an attractive little collection of Sermons. Confidence in God, From Death to Life, the

Holy Innocents, The Faithful Departed, St. Agnes, are topics upon which the writer dwells with engaging force.

The Benzigers are preparing a series of School Readers which promises some new features in the manner of presenting the exercises and the illustrations, some of which are rendered specially attractive by the three-color process of printing.

The publication of Mark Twain's book on *Christian Science*, the substance of which appeared in the *North American Review* (monthly), has been postponed. The book was ready, but the publishers (Harpers) have probably met with obstruction from Mrs. Eddy's agents, who look upon the series as a libel. Mark Twain makes a clever exposition of what he considers on good evidence a gigantic fraud appealing, under the plea of religion, to the credulity and sentimentality of the masses. The author, whilst probably effecting some good by throwing strong light upon certain transactions of the "Christian Science" bureau, follows the bent of an often irreverent humor by repeating certain threadbare misapprehensions regarding the Catholic Church, to whose methods he chooses to compare some of Mrs. Eddy's inventions. The two institutions are as far apart as heaven and earth—and farther. But Mark Twain has not the brain-metal which would permit him to make the serious discrimination such as a careful study of the Old Religion demands. Men that become converts to the Catholic Church from conviction are not, either in their intellectual or moral fibre, like the crowds that enter the Christian Science ranks.

The smallest readable Breviary thus far published, in four parts, has just been issued by the Tournai Society of St. John (Wiltzius Company).

Sick Calls, by the Rev. Alfred M. Mulligan (Birmingham), who has been a frequent contributor to the REVIEW on the subject of pastoral care of the sick, is a new book now in press. (Benziger Brothers.)

The Christian Press Association is to publish the Very Rev. Dr. Alexander MacDonald's volume on the Authorship of the Apostles' Creed. This is one of the most complete and reliable works, we venture to say, as yet written on this important subject. Those who have read the author's keen analysis of Harnack's views and his recent articles on the Apostolic authorship in the REVIEW, will understand the value of the book as an apologetic weapon in the modern warfare between rationalism and Christianity.

In the current DOLPHIN we publish a modern version, by Miss I. L. Guiney, of a hymn in honor of Our Blessed Lady which she discovered in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. By some oversight the original copy by John Mirk, Prior of Lilleshull in Shropshire, did not reach us in time to appear with the modernized version. We shall publish it, however, in the June number.

Books Received.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

COMPENDIUM JURIS REGULARIUM. Auctore P. Augustino Bachofen, S.T.B., Benedictino Abbatiae Immac. Conceptionis, B. M. V., Conception, Mo., U. S. A. Neo-Eboraci, Cincinnati, Chicagiae: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 441. Price, $2.50 *net.*

DE MATRIMONIO. Ad Usum Scholarum ex Summa Theologiae Moralis. Exprimendum curavit H. Noldin, S.J., S. Theologiae professor in Universitate Oenipontana. Cum Approbatione Episcopi Brixinensis et Superiorum ordinis. Oeniponte. Typis et sumptibus Fel. Rauch. (Fr. Pustet.) 1903. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 218. Price, $1.00 *net.*

DE IEIUNIO ECCLESIASTICO. Tractatus Theoreticus et Practicus. Auctore Iosepho Alberti, S. Theol. et utr. Iuris Doctore, Canonico Theologo, Prof. S. Theol. Dogm. et Moralis in Ven. Semin. Aquipendiensi, etc. Romae: Officina Librariae Pontificalis. Friderici Pustet. 1903. Pp. 80. Price, $0.30.

LE PRÉDICATEUR DES RETRAITES DE PREMIÈRE COMMUNION. Contenant dix retraites variées de chacune sept instructions, suivies de vingt-cinq instructions pour le jour de la fête. Par Deux Missionaires, Auteurs de livres ouvrages de Sciences sacrées. Paris: Ancienne Maison Charles Douniol; P. Téqui. 1903. Pp. viii—384. Prix, 4 f. 50.

GLAUBEN UND WISSEN. Eine Orientierung in mehreren religiösen Grundproblemen der Gegenwart für alle Gebildeten. Von Victor Cathrein, S.J. Freiburg Brisg. (St. Louis, Mo.): B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 245. Price, $0.85 *net.*

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES. Lecture by the Very Rev. Aloysius M. Blakely, C.P., Vicar General of Nicopolis, Bulgaria. Pp. 24.

THE GIFT OF PENTECOST. Meditations on the Holy Ghost. By Father Meschler, of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the German by Lady Amabel Kerr. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway. 1903. Pp. xi—505. Price, $1.60 *net.*

ST. EDMUND. Archbishop of Canterbury. His Life as told by old English Writers. Arranged by Bernard Ward, President of St. Edmund's College, Old Hall. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway. 1903. Pp. xx—290. Price, $1.60 *net.*

BLESSED CUTHBERT MAYNE. Protomartyr of the Seminaries, 1544–1577. By W. Meyer-Griffith. London: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 39. Price, $0.30 *net.*

LIFE OF ST. RITA OF CASCIA. From the Italian. By the Very Rev. Richard Connolly, O.S.A., D.D. London: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row; New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 272. Price, $1.00 *net.*

THE SACRED HEART BOOK. By the Rev. F. X. Lasance. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1903. Pp. 638. Price, $0.75.

A.M.D.G. "A VOICE THAT IS STILL." Words written or spoken by the late Fr. James Clarke, S.J. With a sketch of his life, by Fr. McLeod, S.J. Arranged by the Sisters of Notre Dame, and sold for the benefit of the native mission at Empandeni, Rhodesia, in which Father Clarke was much interested. London: Burns and Oates, Ltd.; New York: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 115. Price, $0.75 *net.*

VIA SALUTIS, or Various Methods of the Exercise of the Way of the Cross. Rev. Joseph Mueller, O.S.B. Cum permissu Superiorum. New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company. 1903. Pp. 245.

HELPS TO A SPIRITUAL LIFE. For Religious and for all persons in the world who desire to serve God fervently. From the German of Rev. Joseph Schneider, S.J. With additions by Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 257. Price, $1.25 *net.*

SAINT ALOYSIUS' SOCIETY MANUAL. Compiled from approved sources, with the approbation of the Rt. Rev. Bishop of Buffalo. Eighth Edition. Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 180.

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION.

L'ÉGLISE ET LA PITIÉ ENVERS LES ANIMAUX, textes originaux puisés à des sources pieuses. *Premier recueil*, édition revue et corrigée, et *second recueil*, sous la direction de Mme. la marquise de Rambures, avec une préface de M. Robert de la Sizeranne. Un vol. in-12, orné d'une belle gravure. Paris: Librairie V. Lecoffre. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

ARISTOTLE'S PHILOSOPHY. A Treatise on the Principle of Life (*De Anima* and *Parva Naturalia*). Translated with Introduction and Notes by William Alexder Hammond, M.A., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Ancient and Mediæval Philosophy in Cornell University. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd.; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. lxxxvi—339. Price, $3.00 *net.*

MENTAL AND MORAL HEREDITY IN ROYALTY. I—IX. By Dr. Frederick Adams Woods, Harvard University. Reprinted from *The Popular Science Monthly*, August, 1902—April, 1903. Pp. 85.

HANDBOOK OF THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By Dr. Albert Stöckl. Part II: Scholastic Philosophy. Translated by T. A. Finlay, S.J., M.A., Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, Professor of Mental Science, University College, Dublin. Dublin: Fallon & Co., Ltd. 1903. Pp. 288-446. Price, 5s. *net.*

A READING CIRCLE MANUAL. How to Form and Conduct Reading Circles. Lines of Work and Suggestive Programmes. By Humphrey J. Desmond, author of *Mooted Questions of History; The Church and the Law; Chats within the Fold*, etc. Milwaukee: The Citizen Company. 1903. Pp. 83.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION FOR THE YEAR 1900-1901. Volume II. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1902. Pp. vii—1217-2512.

CATHOLIC CITIZENS AND PUBLIC EDUCATION. A brief statement giving Report of Attendance and Expenses of Parish Schools in the City of New York. New York: The Catholic Book Exchange. 1903. Pp. 32.

ST. BASIL THE GREAT ON GREEK LITERATURE. The Saint's Address to Students. With Notes and Vocabulary by Edward R. Maloney. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company. Pp. 86.

HISTORY.

History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages. By Johannes Janssen. Vol. V and VI. Translated from the German by A. M. Christie. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway. 1903. Pp. xvi—574. Price, $6.25 *net.*

Catholic London Missions. From the Reformation to the year 1850. By Johanna H. Harting. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway; London Sands & Co. 1903. Pp. 270. Price, $2.00 *net.*

Father Marquette, Jesuit Missionary and Explorer. The Discoverer of the Mississippi. His place of burial at St. Ignace, Michigan. By Rev. Samuel Hedges, A.M., with an Introduction by Rev. John J. Wynne, S.J. New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company. 1903. Pp. 164. Price, $1.00.

Rambles through Europe, the Holy Land and Egypt. By Rev. A. Zurbonsen. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 234. Price, $1.00.

Die Katholische Kirche in Armenien. Ihre Begründung und Entwickelung vor der Trennung. Ein Beitrag zur christl. Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichte. Von Simon Weber, D.D., Prof. Apologet. Friburgens. Freiburg Brisg. (St. Louis, Mo.): B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 532. Price, $3.10 *net.*

Memorial presented by the Roman Catholic Priests of Slovak Nationality to their Eminences the Cardinal Archbishop, Archbishops and Bishops of the United States.—Hungary Exposed.

BELLES-LETTRES.

Roderick Taliaferro. A Story of Maximilian's Empire. By George Cram Cook. With Illustrations by Seymour M. Stone. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company, Limited. 1903. Pp. ix—482.

The Sheriff of the Beech Fork. A Story of Kentucky. By Henry S. Spalding, S.J., author of *The Cave by the Beech Fork.* New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1903. Pp. 223—14. Price, $0.85.

In the Shadow of the Manse. By Austin Rock. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway; London: Sands & Co. 1903. Pp. 267. Price, $1.00 *net.*

The Pagan at the Shrine. By Paul Gwynne, author of *Marta.* New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan & Co. 1903. Pp. 478. Price, $1.50.

A Daughter of the Sierra. By Christian Reid. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 367. Price, $1.25.

The Playwater Plot. By Mary T. Waggaman, author of *Tom's Luck Pot; Nan Nobody*, etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1903. Pp. 188. Price, 60 cents.

The Canterbury Pilgrims. A Comedy. By Percy Mackaye. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company, Limited. 1903. Pp. viii—210. Price, $1.25.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—JUNE, 1903.—NO. 6

ANNUAL RETREATS FOR THE REVEREND CLERGY.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW of last June contained an article headed "Father Mac on Retreats," which the present writer read with lively interest. There is much wise thought and sound sense hidden beneath its playful, good-natured style; and many a pregnant suggestion is presented for those who provide the material comforts of the exercitants, as well as for the Spiritual Director who gives out the meditations.

For the dispensers of the physical comforts how significant are these lines: "The truth is, that this was the first retreat Father Mac had spent comfortably; and we have no less an authority than St. Ignatius for the principle, which is confirmed by universal experience, that there is no such thing as praying devoutly, much less meditating, whilst the poor body is racked in an uncomfortable posture. And uncomfortable in the harshest sense of the word were the physical conditions under which hitherto Father Mac had made his annual retreat. Oh! those dreadful beds!" etc.

And for the Spiritual Director there is so much good sense in Willie's complaint, when it is founded in truth, as it sometimes is: "I have been depressed all the week. And it is the lectures! I have never heard anything so gloomy and melancholy since I took Orders."

Certainly, gloomy and depressing thoughts should not be the prevailing tone of such retreats. In missions preached to seculars, among whom there are likely to be habitual and hardened sinners who live as if there were no God, nor judgment, nor punishment

here or hereafter, it is necessary to present in their full impressiveness the most terrifying truths of religion. But the clergy are a very different body of men; they are the ministers of God, the bosom friends of the loving Saviour; their thoughts are the thoughts of the Church, their affections in the main those of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. They are fighting the battles of the Lord, and fighting them bravely, often heroically, and on the whole successfully. Why should the truths proposed for their meditation be gloomy and depressive?

The Spiritual Exercises performed at the clergy retreat are usually understood to be those of St. Ignatius. Is it the spirit of this Saint to overwhelm with the terrors of God's judgments the friends of God, the fellow-laborers of Christ? It is quite the contrary. He would cheer these on, and encourage them to do their noble work with renewed ardor; to purify, indeed, the eye of their intention, and to wash the feet of their human nature from all earthly stains; but to do all this in the spirit in which Jesus washed the feet of His Apostles.

St. Ignatius takes special pains to explain how the Director of a retreat should follow the example of the good angels; and how these encourage the friends of God, and reserve their alarms for the hearts of obstinate sinners. He treats this matter in the seventh of his "Rules for the Fuller Discretion of Spirits." There he says: "The two spirits insinuate themselves differently into the minds of those who are advancing in the way of salvation; the good one gently, peaceably, and sweetly, like a drop of water entering into a sponge; but the evil one rudely, roughly, violently, and noisily, as a shower beating upon a rock. While to those who go daily from bad to worse the direct opposite happens. The reason of this difference is in the different attitude of the soul towards either angel. For if either spirit finds her contrary to him, he assails her with noise and violence, which may easily be perceived; but if conformable to himself, he enters quietly as into his own house with the door open." Thus the spirit of God enters gently into the hearts of His friends; and the Director of the retreat is to be the voice of that Heavenly Consoler.

One principal reason why the mind of St. Ignatius is often departed from in clergy retreats is that some Directors dispense

altogether with that portion of the Exercises which is the very bone and marrow of the Ignatian method—namely, the meditations. These are replaced by discourses, very learned, perhaps, and practically instructive, highly valuable as adjuncts to the meditations, but totally inadequate to act as substitutes for the same. In a good retreat the soul is brought face to face with its God, the servant with the Master, the sinner with his Judge, the minister with the Dispenser of grace, the sheep with the Shepherd, the prodigal son with his loving Father; the zealous but weak-hearted Peter meets the compassionate glance of his suffering Lord.

Now all this is effected in the meditations, not in the elegant or learned or entertaining discourses. It is in the meditations that the Divine Physician probes the wounds of the soul and applies the healing balm; or gently whispers to the fainting heart: "Why art thou fearful? I have overcome the world; thou canst do all things in Him who strengtheneth thee;—Well done, good and faithful servant; because thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will place thee over many;—Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My lambs," etc.

But which of these and other thoughts, very different, perhaps, shall be emphasized to advantage for every one among the exercitants? Their souls are not all alike in grace, in habits of fidelity, in earnestness of purpose, in generosity, in love. The Director will speak the same language to the ears of all; but every one will meditate for himself, and pause to consider what especially regards him. He will presently speak to his Lord and Master the language of gratitude, or of repentance, of supplication for more light and grace, of firm resolve, of self-humiliation at the sight of his shortcomings; of faith with the believing Centurion, of hope with the Blind Man by the wayside, of love with the Beloved Disciple, of contrition and hope with the Good Thief on the cross.

In an assembly of a hundred priests meditating on the same truth, just explained to them by the Director, not two hearts may be giving forth at the same time the same note of response to the touch of the Divine Spirit, who is stirring in each the chords of the inmost soul; for "the Spirit breatheth where He will; and

thou hearest His voice; but thou knowest not whence He cometh, and whither He goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." The priests rise from their meditation together; but a different effect has been produced upon every individual heart. The grand truths of religion are the same for all souls; those selected by St. Ignatius for the retreat are the most radical and the most basic. They almost compel every exercitant to search into the very depths of his thoughts, his motives, his inmost heart. Beneath the loving eye of his Master, the priest in meditation sees and feels his real condition, his wants, his weaknesses, his aspirations, his hopes, his fears, far more clearly than any human instructor could reveal them.

When the heart has thus been stirred to its depth, and not before, it will be ready to form its resolutions of amendment, of increased zeal, of loving generosity for the future. Then, and not till then, will the soul accept all the wise advice of the prudent Director; then will the minister of God enter into the details of his spiritual functions, and determine cheerfully what in his individual case must be his practical resolutions, how he must provide for his progress in priestly virtues, how he must instruct his people, manage his schools, encourage his sodalists, drive off the wolves from his flock, attend the sick, comfort the afflicted, extend the knowledge of religion among unbelievers, and make the odor of sanctity spread far and wide from his home and church.

But there may be exceptional souls among those engaged in the Exercises who need a thorough awakening from a sad state of lethargy, perhaps from the very depths of despondence or hardened sinfulness. For such the eloquent preacher would have to wield the thunders of God's justice; the thoughts most salutary to them would be gloomy and depressive for the pure souls of so many among his hearers. When meditations are used instead of discourses, this difficulty is avoided. Whether the subject be the justice or the mercy of God, the sentiments of each heart will take their coloring from the condition of the soul. Suppose the meditation is on the eternal punishment of hell—and it would be hard to find a more distressing truth—certainly every one will begin by considering the evil of sin, the weakness

of man, and the danger to which every soul is exposed of perishing eternally. It is well for all of us to be reminded of this, and thus to be urged to take good care of ourselves. But the fervent and faithful priest may soon be guided by the Spirit to conceive sentiments of the warmest gratitude for having been led from his youth into the path of virtue. He may perhaps spend the greater part of his meditation in pouring out his heart to the Divine Goodness for not having perished long ago: *Misericordiae Domini quontam non sumus consumpti.* Meanwhile his next neighbor is praying for the salvation of sinners who are likely to be lost. Another is examining his conscience to see whether he has done his full duty by his parishioners in order to keep them from eternal damnation. Another again is planning a mission for his people and begging the Lord to bless his efforts. There is nothing like meditations to unite the heart of the priest intimately with the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In them, as St. Ignatius emphatically teaches, the Creator must be allowed to deal directly with His creature. This is the pith and marrow of his Spiritual Exercises; and a retreat without meditations would be like "Hamlet" with the Prince of Denmark left out.

The reason why some Directors of retreats dispense with the meditations and substitute discourses for them may be that they are not themselves familiar with the practice of meditating. Or they have never studied the Exercises of St. Ignatius thoroughly; but they have genius and zeal, and they think they can draw on their own resources to supply what they conceive will be just as good as the old method, if not considerably better. They may be men of learning and eloquent speakers whom it may be a pleasure to listen to; they may be distinguished for their skill in the management of other important affairs; but the giving of such retreats is a specialty which they have not mastered. Perhaps they do not even appreciate it highly. St. Ignatius had found in his Exercises the source of his holiness, and the means of sanctifying St. Francis Xavier, Blessed Peter Favre, and all his first companions. He looked on them as a boon given him from Heaven for the perfecting of countless souls. Therefore he inculcated the practice of them so earnestly upon his followers; it is the main spiritual training of all the members of his Society in every generation.

First of all, every novice, soon after his entrance into the Society of Jesus, makes a retreat of thirty days continuously, under the direction of the ablest guide that can be procured. During the month he observes absolute silence, and has no communication with any one but the Father Director. He makes four or five meditations a day, besides a quarter of an hour before each exercise to prepare for it, and another quarter of an hour after it, to examine how it has been performed. The intervening portions of each day are almost entirely spent in vocal prayer, pious reading, examination of conscience, and other spiritual occupations. Every year for all the rest of a Jesuit's life, he devotes eight continuous days in exactly the same manner, to an abridged repetition of the same Exercises.

After about fifteen years spent in religion, when he has finished the lengthy studies of the Society, and before he enters on the continuous exercise of the sacred ministry, the Jesuit priest spends an entire year in the special study of the interior life, particularly of the manner of giving missions and retreats; and he spends one full month again in performing the Exercises of St. Ignatius, just as he had done in the first year of his novitiate. Of course, he does this with such increase of thoroughness as must naturally result from his maturer years and more perfect preparation of mind and heart. Nor is this all. The Exercises of St. Ignatius have been made into a daily drill for the followers of the soldier Saint. Every morning, before the world around him is astir, every Jesuit, young and old, the newest novice and the veteran worn out with toil, all spend a full hour in deep meditation on subjects mostly connected with the Exercises. And this universal practice is not only recommended, but it is rigidly enforced; no one is considered as even a passably good Jesuit who does not make his daily hour of meditation.

The Superiors of the Society never tire of stimulating their subjects to this thorough study of their principal speciality, the Exercises of the retreat. As late as March 1, 1900, the present Father General, V. Rev. Lewis Martin, S.J., sent a circular letter to all the members of the Order, in which he said: "I would seize this opportunity to address to all of Ours an earnest word of exhortation, asking them carefully to consider how important it is

that they learn to use the God-given instrument of the Exercises with such aptitude and wisdom as to reap from them the wonderul and almost incredible harvest which it was the happiness of our forefathers ever to reap from them. For the Spiritual Exercises are the domestic equipment of the Society, furnished from on high to our holy Founder, and entrusted to her as a special and singular gift for the purpose of attaining, with unfailing efficacy, her twofold end. But in order to test their marvellous power, both for our own good and for the good of others, we should be able to handle these arms with that skill and dexterity with which our holy Father St. Ignatius would have had us handle them when he bequeathed them to us. It would surely be unseemly if we were satisfied to go to the school of the Exercises at intervals only, and acquire a merely superficial knowledge of them. Nor is it enough if in retreats we follow the guidance and inspiration of the Divine book, as it were, from afar. No! we must bestow upon the book of Exercises intense study, prolonged thought, and reflection; we must unfold to ourselves and thoroughly grasp the deep meaning of the words . . . .

"Now, all this demands long and untiring study; wherefore, our Institute again and again insists that those who are to give the Exercises be men of well-known and proved spirituality, who have themselves first made trial of the Exercises and experienced in themselves their power and sweetness; who have been carefully trained to give them with skill and knowledge, who have read the book through and devoted to it lengthy and mature reflection, and keep on reading it frequently and always have it at hand; who seek advice of other experienced men; men in a word who strive with all their might to make the Exercises thoroughly their own."

Cardinal Wiseman appears to have understood all this fully; if every Director could be like him, the fruits of the yearly retreats would be far more copious than they are now at times. He not only expresses the highest appreciation of their value, but he also explains how necessary it is that the plan of their saintly author be faithfully and closely followed if they are to produce abundant fruit. He says of them in his preface to a translation of the Spiritual Exercises: "It is a plan by a master-mind (unless we admit

a higher solution), capable of grappling with perhaps the most arduous and complicated task, and, without overlooking a difficulty, and apparently without proportionate means, confident of success." The higher solution which he suggests, the direct aid of Divine assistance, is believed in by many; and it becomes the more probable if we remember that St. Ignatius wrote the book of the Exercises before he had performed any studies in theology or philosophy, or acquired what may be called an education, when he was but a recent convert from a life of worldliness, a mere child in the experiences of the spiritual life.

Further on, Cardinal Wiseman writes: "The form and distribution of the Exercises must be strictly kept, and no anticipation nor inversion must be permitted. It is impossible to make the slightest change in this respect without injury. Gladly would I enter fully into this subject, and show the admirable and beautiful chain-work which connects all the Exercises or meditations from the first to the last—connects them as clearly and as intimately as any series of sound mathematical propositions can be connected. But it would take a long essay to do justice to this matter. It is, however, to this logical and argumentative arrangement that the Exercises, in great measure, owe their certainty of result. The mind may struggle against the first axiom, or rather demonstrable truth, in the series; but once satisfied of this, resistance is useless, as unreasonable; the next consequence is inevitable, conclusion follows conclusion, and the triumph is complete. The passions may entrench themselves at each step behind new works, but each position carried is a point of successful attack upon the next, and grace at length wins their very citadel. Many is the fool who has entered into a retreat to scoff, and remained to pray."

But when the retreat is given by those who are imperfectly versed in the matter, and who perhaps fail to appreciate both its excellence and its difficulties, we need not be surprised if mistakes are made which considerably lessen the fruits of the Exercises. Yet it is very evident that the clergy should get, on so important an occasion as the annual retreat, the ablest Directors that can be had. The sacrifices made by the Reverend gentlemen who assemble from all parts of the diocese, often travelling one hundred, or two or even three hundred miles for the purpose, leaving their

parishioners unattended for an entire week, going to more pecuniary expenses than some of them can well afford; the unavoidable inconveniences they are sometimes subjected to, and which Father Mac has not exaggerated;—all this is willingly borne in the hope of reaping from it an abundant spiritual harvest. Such hope will not be disappointed if the retreat is properly performed.

The fruits of a good retreat are rich and varied: the fervor of the priestly life for the coming year is more dependent on the annual retreat than on any other preparation; the retreat secures the personal virtue of the pastor and the care he will take of his church, his school, his sodalities, and his entire flock. His assiduity in the confessional and in visits to the sick; his patience with sinners, and his zeal in the instruction of neophytes; his fidelity and piety in offering the daily Sacrifice of the Mass, saying the Divine Office, performing his daily meditation and examination of conscience are usually proportionate to the fervor with which he has made his annual retreat. The Spiritual Exercises provide for a thorough purification of the heart; and what good housekeeper would do without a thorough house-cleaning at least once a year? The retreat is the plowing of the spiritual field and the sowing of a new crop of holy resolutions.

Of course, a retreat may be given in less perfect ways than is desirable and yet accomplish some valuable results; but in view of the importance of the matter no one will doubt that it should be given in the best possible way. Now it cannot be reasonably expected that, of the Directors who depart from the plan of St. Ignatius, many will be such geniuses or such saints as to improve on the Exercises by their novel experiments. The charm of novelty might be highly appreciated, if the Rev. Clergy had assembled to be entertained rather than solidly benefited. Whatever pleasure they may feel in meeting their friends and brethren in the sacred ministry, the companions of their youth, whom perhaps they have not seen for many months or years, true priests desire and ought to desire, above all things to make a good retreat. And if there should be among the exercitants one or more who have no such desire, these above all need to be aroused from the state of lukewarmness, which is a dangerous state for a priest to be in. To these the Spirit of God wishes to speak as He did of

yore to the Angel of the Church of Laodicea, to whom He said: "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot. I would thou wert cold or hot. But because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will begin to vomit thee out of My mouth. Such as I love I rebuke and chastise. Be zealous, therefore, and do penance. Behold I stand at the gate and knock. If any man shall hear My voice, and open to Me the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him and he with Me," etc. (Apoc. 3.)

Every one who ministers at the sacred altars must have a heart as pure as the clean linen he uses during the Holy Sacrifice; his soul should be as stainless as his chasuble and stole, as bright as the golden chalice and ciborium; for there is nothing in the Church that is dearer to the Heart of Jesus than His consecrated ministers. But no priest could remain holy and fervent for years without frequent renovation of spirit; and for this purpose the retreat is a most efficient and almost indispensable provision. Therefore our archbishops and bishops, following in the footsteps of St. Charles Borromeo, provide so solicitously, year after year, for the diocesan retreat.

The Bishop of Bishops himself, the Supreme Pontiff, has, not long since, given a bright example of his earnestness to promote the sanctification of his own clergy in this manner. Though weakened by his extraordinary age, he wished, on the occasion of the Holy Year, to attend in person the retreat which he desired to be given in his own palace. An eye-witness speaks thus of the arrangements: "The Exercises were given at the express command of His Holiness, who, I have been assured, himself crushed all the objections thereto; and they were given in the Vatican for the convenience of the Cardinals, Prelates, and Ecclesiastics of the Palace, that they might better prepare themselves for the Holy Year. For this purpose, His Excellency, the Major-domo of His Holiness, invited the Roman Provincial of the Society of Jesus to send two of his Fathers to give the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius at the Vatican.

"As the advanced age of the venerable nonagenarian made the frequent descent to the Pauline Chapel troublesome for him, it was arranged, with his consent, to have the Exercises in the 'Sala del Trono,' adjoining his apartments. On the platform of

the throne a neat altar without a tabernacle was erected. On the gospel side and on the predella a small table with a crucifix was placed for the preachers. With this slight change, the Holy Father was able to attend all the meditations and conferences, except the conference at three o'clock, when he felt the absolute need of repose. . . . I will not give a list of the subjects treated, since they were substantially those of the Book of the Exercises, and given in the usual order, as far as the limit of time and the character of the distinguished audience allowed. Father Remer, S.J., who had charge of the meditations, gave the opening and closing exercises. He explained during half an hour, with much force of reasoning and with abundant quotations from the Holy Scriptures, meditations on the end of man, the malice of sin, the four last things, and some mysteries of the life and passion of Christ. He was not a little encouraged, on finishing the first meditation, to meet His Holiness as he was leaving the hall, and to hear from his august lips, among other things, the following words: 'Very good! First rate! We have found your words very suitable to benefit our souls; which is the end for which we are all following the Exercises.' "

At the end of the retreat, the Pope called the two Directors into his private apartments, where he conversed with them for an entire hour. He spoke of the Exercises, recognizing in the method of St. Ignatius the most efficacious instrument of sanctification, especially for the clergy. "Would," he added, "that two or three hundred of my Prelates could have heard you." He called to mind how, when a young man, he went through the Exercises in the houses of the Society of Jesus, especially at San Eusebio, and spoke in high praise of the Father Director at that time, adding that he still had the notes he had taken of the more striking and useful matter of the meditations.

St. Ignatius insists earnestly on the necessity of recollection, and the exclusion of all needless causes of distraction during the retreat. This is the very meaning of the word "retreat." He enumerates the principal advantages usually resulting for the exercitant from this temporary solitude, as follows: "The first, that by the exclusion of his friends and acquaintances, and of affairs less well ordered for the service of God, he attains before

God no small merit. The second, that, in a retreat of this kind his intellect is less drawn in different directions than usual, and his whole thought is collected and centered on one purpose, namely to obey God his Creator, and consult the salvation of his soul; and thus he can use his natural powers in a freer and more unencumbered way in seeking what he so much desires. The third, the more the soul finds herself separate and solitary, the fitter she renders herself for seeking and finding her Creator and Lord; and the nearer she approaches to Him, the better she is disposed to receive the gifts of the Divine Goodness."

There may be in given cases reasons for allowing certain hours of conversation every day of the retreat, for instance an hour after dinner and one after supper. Whether this should be done or not on a particular occasion is usually best decided by the Rt. Rev. Bishop; he is apt to know his clergy and their circumstances most fully; he is well qualified to form a prudent judgment in a matter so conducive to the good of his entire flock; and he has the special light from Heaven, the grace of vocation, for the government of the diocese entrusted to him by the Divine Spirit.

CHARLES COPPENS, S.J.

Creighton University, Omaha, Neb.

"THE EXPERIENCES OF A COUNTRY CURÉ."

WHILE every phase and aspect of royalty, every remote corner in the home-life of contemporary celebrity, has been explored, expatiated on, illustrated and commented, to glut the insatiable curiosity of what is called (save the mark!) the *reading* public of the twentieth century; while author, actor, miner, artisan, the prince in his castle, the servant in her kitchen, have been interviewed, criticised, paragraphed with sickening iteration and still more vulgar adulation, there still remains a certain number of very typical lives, with whose outlines the world is more or less unfamiliar.

The clever and vivid pen of the author of *My New Curate*

and of *Luke Delmege*, has filled up one of these canvasses, in his portrait of the Irish priest—as he was, and as he is to-day; and none of his readers can now plead ignorance of the daily life, the aims and objects, the surroundings and aspirations, of that great body of men who for centuries past may be more truly said to have *ruled Ireland* than ever did its Saxon conquerors.

But the Irish priest, to an Irish family, is as one of themselves. They know all about him. His college life, indeed, withdrew him for a space from them, so that he returns, like young Luke Delmege, full of new, high aspirations, of academic definitions and philosophic platitudes; but he soon settles down to parish life, and his own, thank God! is as simple and open as the day. At home in cottage and castle alike, his place ever ready at lordly board or by the farmer's chimney corner, friend of the poor, counsellor of the young, comforter of the aged, the *soggarth aroon* can scarce feel cut off from all the most human springs of existence.

But—cross the strip of channel to the next Catholic country, fair France, and a very different atmosphere is at once apparent. Who among us, having sojourned for a time in *French* France, the France of her own people, not the Riviera or seacoast peopled by foreigners—who among us has not felt and learned (did he care to do so) the subtile, intangible barrier which fences around those quiet, black-robed men, who pace so tranquilly up and down their churches, sit so patiently hour by hour within their confessionals, respond so courteously to every appeal, yet all the time with a look in their eyes, half questioning, half defiant, as though apologizing for their presence or expecting to be entrapped unawares?

It is difficult to account for the fact that so profoundly and intensely Catholic a country as France has been, until the third Republic sapped her faith—a country which has merited the appellation of Eldest Daughter of the Church; which has been the pioneer of religion and civilization alike beyond the seas; whose sons have been chief among missionaries in distant countries; and whose Religious watered many a land of darkness with their blood in martyrdom—should yet bear inner tokens of a deep-rooted hostility between her priests and her people. They

have been so pious, so blameless, so faithful, these priests of France, from the old troupes of penniless *emigrés* a century ago, to whom the Catholic England owes so much, down to our own day; and yet—they have lost their hold upon the people.

A certain clever and entertaining writer in French Catholic reviews and elsewhere—he signs himself *Yves le Querdec*—has given us, not many years since, what is probably a more or less fancy picture of the life and experiences of a good Republican country curé, which presents a vivid picture of the social and political difficulties lying in wait for many a newly appointed village priest in the France of to-day; and his hero is made to demonstrate to perfection, what so many of the Church's enemies have essayed to disprove, how a good parish priest can at the same time remain a loyal Republican. The picture is perhaps too artificial a one to evoke keen sympathy, though throwing many a sidelight on the daily life of those whom it depicts; and it is probably written rather with the object of showing the young priests of France how to reconcile the ofttimes conflicting claims of Church and State, than to exhibit their difficulties to the outside world.

But about the time that the *Lettres d'un Curé de Campagne* were appearing, month by month, in the pages of a French ecclesiastical review, and long before *My New Curate* had delighted the English-reading world, the present writer came by chance, among a number of dingy, half-forgotten volumes in a Swiss circulating library, upon a quaint little volume purporting to be the autobiography—or rather the experiences of a year—of a country curé.

He was evidently a man of some distinction in the literary world, and had begun his more adventurous career amid the strange and stormy scenes of the ill-fated Emperor Maximilian's brief reign in Mexico. Our travelled abbé, with the accumulated literary *impedimenta* of some twenty-five volumes of MSS., on many subjects, and an already varied experience as, "by turns military chaplain, historian, journalist, ethnologist," etc., etc., had formed part of that famous "clerical cabinet" which one fears had contributed in no small measure to the unpopularity of the well-meaning but feeble ruler whom French bayonets had placed upon

the throne; and while their unfortunate chief expiated his own weakness upon the Cerro de las Campanas (and on the self-same spot where a month before he had made his last stand), his ministers found themselves swept aside like unconsidered and forgotten trifles floating on the waves, amid the chaos of a great shipwreck.

Poor Maximilian! Incapable ruler, abandoned from without, betrayed from within, yet ever, as a recent American writer has expressed it, "the well-bred gentleman, who, aware of his failure, was ready to stand by it and to pay the extreme penalty of his errors." Was ever more pathetic embodiment of the old, significant maxim, *noblesse oblige!* "Before the figure of Maximilian of Austria, from the time when he took command of his little army, and resolved to stand for better or for worse by those who had remained faithful to his fallen fortunes, all true-hearted men must bow with respect. From this time forth his words and acts were noble; and in his attitude at this supreme moment, his incapacity as a chief executive, his moral and intellectual limitations as a man, are overlooked. We forget that he was no leader when we see how well he could die."

The subject of these pages, with others, returned "sadder but wiser men" to their native land; he, at least, beginning, as he confesses, to feel the necessity for leading a more priestly and less worldly life, yet fain to accept, as "compensation," from the Ministre de l'Interieur, a post as examiner of political and religious pamphlets destined for sale by colportage—a government post of some responsibility. This, however, he looked on as a mere provisional affair, having won the joint promise of a Cardinal and an Archbishop (Mgr. Darboy) that the first vacant Canonry of St. Denys, bringing all that learned leisure and religious seclusion for which he longed, should be his. Somehow, as not infrequently happens in such cases, each rare vacancy, as it occurred, was filled up—by Court favor; and the priestly journalist, who made by his pen, so he assures us, something like 10,000 francs a year, remained a journalist and nothing more. Another hope was of an appointment as chaplain to Isabella II of Spain, the Queen Mother, Christine, being a personal friend of his; but "sovereigns are rarely the masters, even over their own palaces," and his Spanish post

remained *château en Espagne!* Later on, another of his friends, a Spanish grandee, proposed his name as tutor to the royal heir, afterwards Alfonso XII; but a *Frenchman* was not permitted the coveted honor.

So he went on writing his by-work, "The Philosophy of History," and awaiting a post where he could be priest as well as writer. "A military chaplaincy would have pleased me well enough," he tells us, "and I had already gone through several campaigns in that capacity; but if, under the Empire, the army was somewhat like a head without a body, under the Republic it had became a body without a head! Moreover, it was impossible to do soldiers any serious good in the ever-moving kaleidoscope of the present barrack system, . . . and one could not but foresee that military chaplaincies would soon be suppressed altogether."

He then went to England to see Lord Granville, whom he had known formerly, and by the aid of whose influence he hoped to secure a permanent post; and, having lately published a little book *in English*, called "Travels in the Great Deserts," tells us that he was "feted and flattered in London society, and presented, side by side with Livingstone and du Chaillu, to the representatives of the Royal Geographical Society at one of their meetings." But Lord Granville, while receiving him with "that perfect courtesy of an English gentleman, whom Montalembert ranked above all the gentlemen of the universe," was unable to place a Frenchman and a priest; so he went southwards to the Riviera, and became attached as English, Spanish, and Italian confessor to a well-known church at Nice.

Here he exercised his ministry among the "strangers" of that season, especially exerting himself on behalf of the American sailors of the fleet anchored off Villefranche, whom he prepared for their Easter duties; and some two hundred of them received their Paschal communion from his hands. The grateful Americans would fain have made him their permanent chaplain, and offered him a present of 5,000 francs, both of which offers he declined, from some mistaken delicacy, which left him at the end of the season the poorer by his whole experiences of that winter, the good *curé* who employed him not having deemed it necessary to offer

him any emolument. During the summer he went to Geneva to ask employment from the confessor-bishop of that unacknowledged see; Monseigneur Mermillod sent him to Vevey, and the priest there, on to the Rhone Valley; amid which wanderings he perforce learned the bitter lesson, "how difficult it is for a missionary, even if burdened with two kilos weight of decorations, titles, brevets, and diplomas from chancellors and learned Societies, to find a position."

In despair, he went to the Grande Chartreuse, resolved to take the habit; but, alas, "one cannot make oneself into a Carthusian whenever one likes!" and here also his prayer for admittance was refused.

After two years spent in Rome, he returned to Paris to publish his now completed book; and then, his thoughts turning once more to a definitely ecclesiastical way of life, and being too old, or at least too weak in health for foreign missions, he resolved to become, what must have felt somewhat like social extinction, a humble parish priest, "*un curé de campagne.*"

Even this obscure post seemed difficult of attainment; but at length, after many months, a diocese was found, whose bishop had not *too many candidates* for his incumbencies, and the little village of Montagnat-le-reconduit became his first parish. "Montagnat-the-brought-back," as the name runs, was a picturesquely-situated but somewhat desolate spot among the Jura mountains; and its quaint name was derived, as the newcomer learned in his first chat with one of its inhabitants, from an odd little incident in its former history. It seems that at some earlier period the villagers, fancying the mountain-side a better site for their village than the hollow where their ancestral homes nestled side by side, snugly enough but "in a hole," as they discontentedly remarked, transported their entire village bodily to the chosen spot, and having duly installed themselves there, made the startling discovery that they had no water! In vain were wells dug here and there; the stony rock refused to yield any moisture; and the disconcerted villagers were forced to return ignominiously to their former valley.

Although such unpracticality seems hardly credible, we recollect an instance within our own experience, of a palatial building, constructed on English lines, by an English architect in France,

where not until the building was completed and let, was it discovered that the same defect obtained. A foundation of rock, an imposing and loftily-situated building, and—no water obtainable, save at such expenditure of mechanical leverage as made that "desirable residence" a thing practically useless. Àpropos of the removed village, our author tells another story, too, of how, in his youth, the municipality of a certain commune, having decided on the construction of a new cemetery, much time and money was expended upon a great circle of wall round the selected space. The walls were finished, a priest duly consecrated the ground, and a baker dying just at the right moment, his body was to inaugurate the enclosure. The grave-digger set to work, . . . tried here, tried there, for about two hours, but not a sod could he turn! The cemetery was one vast expanse of rock . . . . . and the baker's funeral, with all succeeding ones, sorrowfully wended their way down to the old graveyard of their forefathers.

So, one wet, dreary evening in Passion week, the very heart of winter in those mountainous regions, the inhabitants of Montagnat-le-reconduit were made aware, by the time-honored cries of "hue! houp!!" with which the peasant mule-drive at once encourages and threatens his patient if plodding beast, that their new curé was approaching his future domain. Enthroned upon a huge sack of potatoes within a springless cart, drawn by a peculiarly vicious and eccentric mule, "whose filthy tail lashed alternately his own heaving flanks and my face," as its victim wrote later, and led by a lively, but rarely sober miller, who had offered to convey the somewhat disheartened stranger to his destination, the weary traveller, with aching bones and stiffened limbs, essayed in vain to alight from his purgatorial seat, and "bruised and sore from head to foot, especially at the parts equally distant from both," was fain to be lifted down by the brawny arms of some among his parishioners, and introduced into the bare walls and chill darkness of an empty house. Other carts, filled with furniture and packing cases, followed; and "installing furniture, unpacking boxes, putting up beds, by the light of a feeble candle, under snow and rain," was found, though necessary, "an occupation entirely devoid of charm." A grumpsy woman came in, and,

in the tone of one throwing a bone to a dog, growled out, "If you like to come and sup with us, soup is ready!" seeming at the same time to add mentally "I hope you won't!" to which spoken and unspoken remarks the weary curé returned a polite refusal, and sat down to some bread and cheese with his servant, or rather "housekeeper," as the English phrase runs. To one accustomed to the luxurious profusion of the tropics, to the graceful, unkissed shores of Mediterranean lands, or the prolific forests beside the Pacific, such welcome must have seemed cold indeed; and harsh the blurred, snow-driven outlines of his new home.

His first experience among his people seems to have been, that he was looked upon by them as an outsider, and almost doubly so. All over France, from north to south, in provinces where they still remember with pride their independent days, as in towns which cling to their old traditions, and which, perhaps, have in the course of events passed from one nation to another by political systems of exchange and barter, every individual not born within sound of its bells is, to its inhabitants, a "stranger." The officers in their garrisons, the officials in their places, the priest and doctor who minister to their needs, are yet, if not one of themselves, looked upon with coldness, if not with mistrust. Strangely enough, too, according to our author, the very clergy themselves share the same feeling. "When a French priest meets a confrère whom he does not know, he looks him all over, to begin with; then he considers his sacerdotal character, and then—he thaws gradually into cordiality." We have ourselves remarked and commented on the strange veil of suspicious reserve, so to speak, in which the French priest of to-day appears to wrap himself; as when wandering on country walks, or even staying in some small town or country resort, one meets or calls upon "the priest," expectant of welcoming words to a stranger, and a Catholic, ready to show himself "clerically" inclined. Does he take one for a government spy, or a Freemason? you wonder, as you bow adieu to the sphinx-like soutane.

Our new *curé's* first essay was to make the acquaintance of his parishioners; and he accordingly set out to visit the more or less scattered "proprietaires" or peasant landowners belonging to his flock; until finding no one ever at home (for they were one

and all at work in the fields), he perforce put off this duty and turned to the consideration of a more personal point—that of food supply.

When we remember that some eighty or eighty-five per cent. of the French priesthood are drawn from the ranks of *les petits cultivateurs*, or peasant proprietors, we may naturally conclude that they possess neither private fortune nor family expectations.

They have been educated a little above the parental station at the nearest diocesan seminary, either on the joint earnings of father and mother, who save and work with proud diligence to produce the 450 francs yearly which, with some rough clothing and certain small extras, are the usual fee at these colleges; or, failing this, are paid for out of a diocesan fund for the supply of the priesthood. With tastes somewhat refined by education, and a knowledge that the *soutane* of a priest must not be dishonored either by menial work or by too familiar an association with those who by birth are his equals, by the easy camaraderie of the café, or the flippancy of sport or pastime, with every desire to fulfil his life-work and to exercise his ministry worthily, the newly-fledged priest finds himself launched upon a lonely life, and one full of privations.

The usual stipend of a country curé is something under a 1,000 francs, mostly about 900, and on this sum he has to keep house, support himself and a servant, pay taxes, improve his church, give alms, and entertain an occasional visitor.[1] Our author calculates that 600 francs of this must be set aside for wood, wine, the baker, and his servant's wages, leaving only 83 centimes per day (less than two cents) to pay heavy taxes, provide food other than bread for two persons, dress, lights, give alms, pay necessary subscriptions, and entertain guests! He adds that *it is said* that in some parishes the inhabitants make annual presents to their curé, of poultry, eggs, or vegetables, but that *he has never known of such cases.* In some villages, however, a more humiliating proceeding is customary. The village curé goes round from house to house, accompanied by his sacristan and the village mayor, the former bearing an empty sack, into which each householder is invited to

[1] The French clergy have Napoleon I to thank for this parsimonious stipend, fixed at that sum by the terms of the Concordat.

throw a handful of corn, or, in its place, the price of it, given, not to the curé himself, but to the mayor for him.

In the wine provinces, a donation of wine, or of grapes, is supposed to replace this wheat-tithe; àpropos of which he relates an amusing, though ignoble anecdote, as follows: In a certain village in Burgundy, some of the local *proprietaires*, who were also members of the municipal council, by way of being staunch supporters of their curé were accustomed to bring him each year a measure of wine of the preceding vintage. On one occasion, one of these worthies, in a fit of parsimony, grudging his good wine, yet not daring to refuse his usual gift, was struck with what seemed to him a bright idea. The seven chief men of the village were wont to repair together to the curé's cellar, on a certain day, each armed with a measure or watering pot full of wine from their stores, and one after another poured the contents of his measure into an empty barrel set ready to receive the donation. The individual in question, on economy bent, brought, instead of wine, a measure filled with water, saying to himself as he did so, that even should the presence of water in the wine be detected—as undoubtedly would be the case, in that land where every man and boy is a connoisseur as to purity and unity of grape, versed in all the mysteries of first and second shot, coloring, quality and age of wine, and the rest—none could identify the actual culprit. When the barrel had been duly replenished, the curé was called, and invited to taste his present. The tap was turned—the seven standing round—but lo! *a stream of clear water ran out!* The whole seven had acted on the same idea, each trusting to remain undiscovered. The priest, though doubtless mortified, rose to the occasion. "Well, well, my friends," he remarked, "so you see that no wine flows from this barrel! Do you see, it is a little joke that I am playing on you. At the marriage of Cana, our Lord changed water into wine; I have changed your wine into water—to amuse you! However, since you do not appreciate the joke, let us take a glass of wine from another barrel to console us!"

Knowing that his slender income, even supplemented, as it was in his case, by a certain amount of private fortune, would prove insufficient for the claims made upon it, our curé bethought himself of the various means by which his brother priests here and

there were able to supplement their salaries. He would raise vegetables, and keep fowls.

"Planting potatoes and sowing carrots and cabbage seem easy tasks," he tells us, "but what was less easy, for me at all events, was digging and preparing the ground beforehand. Being more at home with the pen than with the spade, at the end of the first hour my hands were covered with blisters. I found, too, that my elegant Parisian boots became speedily reduced to tatters by the stones and rocky paths on which I had to tread; so for my gardening operations I took to wearing *sabots*, that is, wooden-soled country boots. Never having worn such things before, I slipped about in the most agonizing manner, risking every moment the spraining of my ankles or the breaking of my neck. 'You should put nails in your boots, M. le Curé,' remarked a peasant to me; and I did so, only to find that my propensity for slipping was exchanged for a still worse habit of falling backwards unawares. Having nearly succeeded in killing myself about ten times a day, I had to give up the use of *sabots*, except on rare occasions.

"My agricultural efforts not meeting with success, I turned to rabbit-breeding; with the more zest that as, in the remote village where my lot had been cast, meat was only procurable once a week (the postman brought it on Saturdays!), and that my unfortunately delicate stomach could not stand a continual diet of fat bacon, upon which the rest of the villagers lived and throve, I began to look hopefully forward to the prospect of an occasional rabbit. Accordingly I procured some pairs, provided them with suitable food (the 'thyme and sweet herbs' which La Fontaine assures us these animals relish most), and awaited the result. Very soon, to my great satisfaction, I beheld several litters of young ones; but —La Fontaine had failed to inform me that, besides herbs, these interesting quadrupeds are fond of eating—one another! My young ones took to disappearing mysteriously, one after another, and it was not until some time had elapsed, that I discovered that the bucks devour their own young ones. Eventually, and before this fact in natural history had dawned upon me, I was left with my original pairs, which in despair, I ate too!

"Hearing of my disappointment, a brother priest sent me some pigeons to replace the rabbits. They bred also, but the rats

ate all their young. The same kind friend then sent me a handsome white cock and hen, who ate my corn in the most satisfactory manner, but gave me nothing in return; while a brood of young chickens, with their foster-mother, which I bought as a further experiment, ate, chirped, ran about, amused me much in watching them and in studying their ways, but destroyed my garden so thoroughly that I was obliged to shut them up, after which the cost of their food made the few fresh eggs I obtained from them represent an almost fabulous sum. Alas! I had never dreamed in coming to Montagnat that it was so difficult, in the country, to live on the products of the country!

"But more experience awaited me! The bit of ground attached to the presbytery boasted some ten or twelve walnut trees, which were, like vineyards, supposed to be a source of income to its inhabitant, especially in the 'good years' when they bore well; by no means always the case. The first autumn of my experiences, however, was a splendid one for the fruit; and I appealed to one of my parishioners to know what was to be done with it. 'You must make nut oil,' he replied (the *huile de noix*, which in some parts of France is used instead of, and even preferred to, the olive oil of the South).

"'I cannot bear it, it turns my stomach,' I replied.

"'Then sell the nuts.'

"As before selling a bear-skin you must kill your bear, so before selling the nuts they have to be gathered. Some neighbors beat the trees and gathered the fruit for me, in consideration of the sum of six francs—teaching me that in the country one pays dearer than in town for a slight service (in my next parish, indeed, one of my neighbors asked five francs for cutting down about two francs' worth of wood!); and, this done, I found that I had about fifty measures of walnuts to sell. A peasant at once offered me two francs a measure for them, and before accepting I went off to consult my former adviser. He answered me that I ought to get at least three, so I put on a most knowing air and returned to the would-be purchaser.

"'I want three francs a measure.'

"'No, that's too dear!'

"'Never mind, then, I will keep them.'

"He was offering me a very fair price for them, if I had but known, for the nuts were still unshelled. No second offer came, and my nuts began to rot. My kind adviser then informed me that I must shell them, stir them about constantly, and dry them in the sun. In the sun! The sun of the Jura, in winter!! A rarity which one would pay to get a sight of, like a curiosity at a fair! Not to speak of the fact that when one has one's Mass to say, prayers and catechisms to give, the daily office to recite, sermons and studies to prepare, visits and sick-calls to make, one has neither time nor inclination to stand over fifty measures of walnuts, stirring, airing, drying, repacking, every day! At the end of the first week I would have given them all for half of what had been offered me. I had two friends staying with me at the time, and we agreed that, the sun failing to appear, we must dry them in the bread-oven; so we set to work! Heating a bread-oven, when one has never seen such a thing before, as was our case, is by no means so simple an operation as it might seem. We burned about ten faggots of wood in our effort to heat the oven, and, in fact, nearly burned the house down; and we were going on with the performance, when someone charitably told us that it was hot enough. And so it was! Our first batch of nuts was speedily reduced to charcoal. . . . I gave up in despair, and finally my servant continued to sell what was left of the good ones at thirty *sous* the measure, while the greater part, burnt, rotten, or spoilt, served to heat my stove for some days afterwards."

So much for the would-be economies of every-day life. Failing in these, he was fain to fall back upon the dearly bought vegetables of his neighbors, the too frequent fat bacon or tasteless cabbage soup, and to study with half critical, half indulgent sadness the little world into which he had fallen.

His own daily life resolved itself into the following routine: "In winter as in summer I rose at about half-past four, to be in the church at five o'clock. My morning prayers and meditation, preparation for Mass, saying of Mass, thanksgiving and perhaps some confessions, brought me to half-past seven or eight o'clock. Then I took a cup of chocolate—most of my confrères took soup—and then catechizings, preparation of sermons, studies, and the breviary offices, occupied the rest of the morning. Towards

midday I took my lunch, called dinner by those who begin with soup, usually consisting of a dish of meat (when one has any!), a vegetable, a bit of cheese and some fruit, fresh or dry according to the season. Then visits to the church, to the sick; some spiritual reading, a glance at the newspaper or some useful book, and then breviary again. After the evening meal, consisting of soup, some remains of the midday meal, and the invariable cheese or fruit, a prayer in the church and some more reading finishes the evening. On Sundays and feasts, one passes almost the whole day in the church; and a little gardening, or a visit or two may occasionally diversify the monotony of the day."

The description of life in a country presbytery here given, would probably serve for that of many and many a parish priest throughout the length and breadth of France. Even in towns there can be but little social intercourse, for it is severely discouraged by those in authority, and the bishops warn their young seminarists against paying visits or forming acquaintances; probably not without reason, as English-speaking readers would scarcely credit the malevolent watchfulness which awaits their entry into clerical life, quick to imagine evil and to cry scandal. Any innocent hobby, too, or intellectual pursuit, can rarely be indulged in, from the poverty which renders new books, scientific instruments, or other costly materials, impossible luxuries. "A little music or archæology," our author tells us, "may perhaps be indulged in," or should there be some amiable parishioners with a taste for chess, billiards, or other games, some pleasant hours of recreation may be passed thus; but for the most part his mournful conclusion is, that "the *curé de campagne* is a mixture of missionary and cenobite, without the enthusiasms of the former, or the supernatural joys of the latter. His monotonous life has but one refuge—the Altar and his prayers."

None save they who live and move within the narrow circle of village life can know or even guess at its prevailing characteristics. In France, perhaps more than in any other country, Paris represents the nation in all its civilization, its refinement, its art, its intellect. To her, even more than to the English capital, are drawn those who ambition a hearing, a place in the world's life. The other towns are huge gatherings, centres if you will, of trade,

of commerce, of industry; Paris alone is the heart and the brain; while village life, in old times a peaceful, if uncultured human wilderness, has now become a series of small centres for half educated and wholly irreligious intrigue, each one ruled by its mayor and its schoolmaster, to the utter exclusion of the village priest. The villages may or may not be divided into several categories, but their principal divisions are the peasant mayor, the middle class mayor, and the gentleman mayor. The peasant mayor is usually a man eaten up with vanity over his position, who wastes a large amount of his time in strutting about, giving and taking drinks, and proclaiming his own importance. "One day," instances our author, "the mayor of Molain came to buy some beans from one of my parishioners, a grocer. 'Do you know,' uttered this worthy, as the beans were being weighed out before him; 'Do you know to whom you have the honor of speaking?'

"'No, Monsieur.'

"'Well, you have the honor of speaking to the Mayor of Molain!'" (an adjacent village).

This reminds us of a similar occurrence within our own experience. A certain English family, who had for some time rented a property belonging to a middle-class proprietor in the country, and had quite innocently left at the end of their lease without proffering the expected "tip" to the "garde champêtre" of the locality, received from the individual in question a letter which ran somewhat after this fashion:

> Monsieur le Garde Champêtre [in the largest copper-plate handwriting] has not heard from *le sieur* Palbot [expression meaning less than Monsieur] since his departure, although Monsieur le Garde Champêtre has watched and looked after his grounds from time to time, and Monsieur le Garde Champêtre is not accustomed to such neglect, etc., etc.

a production of inflated vanity and studied insolence, which was handed to the nearest magistrate by its recipient.

But to return to our country curé.

"When the peasant mayor is irreligious and bad—and no others are chosen nowadays, under the present Republic—he is simply a cankerworm or centre of corruption to the whole village,

and, of course, the open enemy of its curé. The middle class or bourgeois mayor is much the same in this respect, with the additional disadvantage of domineering over everything and everybody. The gentleman mayor is often an absentee, or else absorbed in hunting and other amusements, leaving his *adjoint* to administer the commune in his stead. When really in earnest, however, they surpass all the rest by their intelligent and devoted supervision of the villages under their sway; for in this as in all else, 'bon chien chasse de race.'"

One of the crosses of the village curé of the present day is the *fromagerie*, or *fruiterie*, as it is called in village parlance; a somewhat curious arrangement, common to all cheese-making districts in France and Switzerland. Each village, or group of villages, possesses a building arranged for cheese-making and for the reception of large quantities of milk, called the *fruiterie*. The villagers, almost without exception, who possess one or more cows, enter into a yearly agreement with their *fruiterie* to supply a specified number of quarts of milk per day to it, and each family in rotation takes the entire milk-supply for one day, and makes it into butter or cheese on the spot. A man in charge, called the *fromager*, keeps the place clean and in order, arranges for the sale and expedition of butter and cheese, and generally manages everything. He is quite a personage among the villagers, who use their *fromagerie* as a kind of club, meeting there of an evening to play cards, smoke, talk, and discuss politics of a more or less liberal tinge, anti-religious as are all resorts and haunts of officialism in the France of to-day. Needless to say, the village curé is anything but a *persona grata* among these rural critics; while from the practical point of view, strangers and housekeepers in general find the existence of these milk depôts the cause of no small inconvenience at times, an extra quart of milk being as difficult to obtain as if in the wilds of Arabia; for the numerous cow-keepers have bound themselves to supply no milk to private families, under penalty of forfeiting their rights in the *fruiterie*.

The village schoolmaster, again, is almost invariably the enemy, open or unavowed, of the curé; and acts as secretary and adviser, almost as a matter of course, to *M. le Maire*, whose ignor-

ance or inefficiency is often thus supplied for by a thoroughgoing representative of republicanism *and of infidelity.*

"Before becoming a curé," writes our author, "I held a favorable opinion of village schoolmasters, based, it must be confessed, upon my absolute want of knowledge; but when I came to know them, I found them uncivil, badly brought up, uninstructed to the last extent, and surprisingly narrow-minded. During the year which I spent at Montagnat-le-reconduit, three schoolmasters in succession filled that post. The first was a drunkard, who spent most of his time in wandering from house to house getting drinks everywhere; the second was deaf and commonplace; the third, revoltingly rude in his behavior; his inspector assured me that he was mad."

As to religion, our author asserts that any honest and respectable schoolmaster who dared show himself openly to be a Christian would get into disgrace with his superiors, a fact corroborated by our own experience in the village guarded by Monsieur le Garde Champêtre already referred to, where the postmaster's wife assured us that her husband, though religious at heart, would lose his place at once did he venture to show himself in any place of worship. Whether the action of the government would be so or not, the people believe it to be thus, and their habitual attitude may be exemplified by the fact that in the same village to which we refer, out of a population of some fourteen hundred, only two (we believe) among the men of the place performed their Easter duties.

Officialism is the bane of the France of to-day. "It is a sad thing to have to confess," writes our curé, "but I fear we (the clergy) have become, without knowing it, religious functionaries instead of apostles. We have become, since the Republic, a *nation of tremblers.* The President trembles for his ministry, the ministry tremble for their portfolios, senators and deputies tremble before their electors, the householder for his property, the clerk for his place, the taxpayer for his pocket, the poor for his bread."

Does this definition throw any light on the attitude of France —Catholic France—during the recent evictions of religious?

But to return to "our village." A certain French writer has said that "he did not like England because there were too many

English there," and our curé quotes this saying in support of his discovery that there were "so many peasants" in the country! True, he was familiar with the type of laboring class as seen in "Italy, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, England, Ireland, Spain, and America," but this very extensive experience soon convinced him that "the peasant, as he exists in France, morally and physically, is nowhere of the same type." He proceeds to show that "in both hemispheres the Anglo-Saxon peasant is a man like any other man, only a man who lives in the country and works the ground instead of living in a town and pursuing some other avocation. There is nothing in his outward appearance to distinguish him from any town workman. Naturally, he does not wear gloves while he is digging, but his manners are about the same as those of his town brethren. The peasants belonging to the Latin races, on the other hand, are distinguished by their greater gaiety and less energy over their work; less cleanliness in their garments, but more coquetry, or in other words, more regard for appearances, than have the Saxon races. His good qualities are attractive, and his very failings are not so gross as are those of other countrymen. But on coming for the first time in contact with our own peasantry, I found myself as it were in an unknown land."

The result of his observations in this unknown land is anything but flattering to the agricultural population of France, and did the verdict fall from any other pen than that of a Frenchman, we might deem it somewhat harsh; coming, as it does, from an experienced observer of human nature in many lands, we can but accept its justice and lament its truth.

"The peasant of the Jura," he says, "and, indeed, of all modern France, is ignorant, narrow-minded, obstinate, and above all, eaten up with pride." This latter qualification, in truth, seems at first sight scarcely applicable to the heavy, stolid, semi-brutish nature of the *petit cultivateur* of the centre of France, and, indeed, "I asked myself where pride could find a place to instal itself in such beings." However, our curé maintains that "obstinacy, which is the distinguishing mark of the peasant, is but pride in disguise, showing itself in an over-confidence in his own worth and a profound mistrust of the powers of others."

The passionate love of the peasant for "his field," his "little bit of land," as the Irishman would call it, is well known and even excusable, taking its rise, as it does, in the sense of hardships suffered and toil expended over their acquisition. It would be almost admirable, did it not bring with it a sordid avarice and still more painful callousness of nature, which shows itself too often in their domestic relations.

Thus, "when illness falls on one member of the family, less haste is made to seek medical aid than would be the case were a cow or pig in question; the rest of the family groan, not over the sufferings of the sick one, but over his enforced illness. They lament, audibly, the time he is losing, or which they are losing in ministering to him, the money he ceases to earn, or that which they are forced to spend on food or medicine; and if he be gravely sick, he will do well, they tell one another, to depart this life without delay!" while, in the village from which our author gathered these dreary experiences, the village mayor habitually permitted burial of the dead before the twenty-four hours' delay prescribed by French law; so impatient were the mourners (?) to put away the poor clay which cumbered the ground.

One can, perhaps, scarcely wonder that among a population so little removed in nobility of sentiment from the brutes which share their roof-shelter, slight regard should be paid to the sacredness of a promise. Yet it shocks one to hear how "all classes of society profess for their own solemn words'the profoundest disdain or at least disregard." To promise, and break their word, is the commonest thing possible among them; while they habitually praise to their face those whom they backbite in private; and gossips, tittle-tattle and scandal are rife from one end of the village to the other. They are eloquent in complaint, if in naught else; and grumble at the dry weather, grumble at the rain, grumble at the harvests, grumble at their neighbors; in fact, as the Breton proverb has it, "When it rains every day it is too much; when it rains every other day it is not enough!"

But now we must leave our country curé in the midst of his flock; a pathetic, patient, heroic figure, as his interpreter has shown him to be.

"Sometimes grave, sometimes gay, he is in harmony with

none of those about him, noble or peasant; yet alone, and bitterly alone as his life must ever be, it is rare to find aught save serenity and patient content upon his rugged features."

The children of his parish, instead of running to him as to a father, are too often threatened with him as an object of terror; while their parents look on him with scarcely veiled aversion, and receive him under their roof grudgingly and with restraint. His very words are listened to with suspicion, and his most innocent actions commented on with "the fierce malevolence" of village gossip. In fine, "he knows neither how he lives nor how he dies; —and how define that life, so laborious, so obscure, so devoted, so despised, passed in doing good, and in receiving—what? Evil from some, indifference from others, gratitude from none."

If indeed these things be so, one may well ask, in view of the present religious and political situation in France, "If these things are done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

T. L. L. TEELING.

Broomfield, Weston-super-mare,
England.

VOTIVE MASSES.

PART III.

RATIONE OBJECTI.

1.—Under this title votive Masses are divided into:

I. Masses of (*a*) Saints and (*b*) Mysteries, whose feasts are celebrated during the year;

II. Masses found at the end of the Missal after the *Commune Sanctorum;*

III. Masses for Various Purposes.

I.—(*a*) SAINTS.

2.—A votive Mass can be celebrated in honor of those saints:

(*a*) Whose names are found in the Roman Martyrology[1] or in the Martyrologies of Religious Orders;

[1] S.R.C., June 30, 1896, n. 3922, III, 1.

(*b*) In the *Ordos* or Directories of Dioceses and Religious Orders;

(*c*) Who from any authentic document are known to be canonized, and in whose honor Mass has been celebrated *ab immemorabili tempore*.[2]

Note.—The document must be *authentic*. It is not enough to find them enrolled in any indifferent catalogue of saints, *e.g.*, Wall-Calendars, Rosary Tickets, Almanacs, etc.

3.—With regard to the Blessed (*Beati*), votive Masses cannot be celebrated in their honor, even though by Apostolic Indult their feasts are celebrated in some places.[3]

4.—Which votive Mass of the saint is to be celebrated?

1°. If the saints have a *proper* Mass, that Mass must be used as the votive,[4] provided always the words are verified and are appropriate even on a day which is not the feast day, or if only a small portion of the Mass must be changed to verify the words, thus:

(*a*) If in the orations the words *festivitas*, *natalitia*, *solemnitas*, etc., occur, they are changed into *memoria*, *commemoratio*, etc.;[5]

(*b*) If the words *hodie*, *hujus diei*, *hodierna die*, *annua*, etc., occur, simply omit them;[6]

(*c*) If an integral part of the Mass proper of the feast would not be appropriate on another day, in the votive Mass this part is changed into another from the *commune* according to the quality of the saint in whose honor the Masses are celebrated, *e. g.*, in votive Masses of St. Agatha or St. Anne, instead of the Introit *Gaudeamus*, read the Introit *Loquebar* and *Cognovi* respectively, unless otherwise notified by the rubrics;[7]

(*d*) Feasts falling in certain cycles have after the Epistle various Graduals, Tracts, *Allelujas*. If votive Masses are celebrated of such saints, these parts must be changed according to the season in which such Masses are celebrated; *e. g.*, the Mass *SS. Septem Fundatorum Ordinis Servorum B. V. M.*, which is celebrated February 11th, will have:

[2] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 214. [3] S.R.C., June 13, 1676, n. 1568.
[4] S.R.C., June 30, 1896, n. 3922, III, 1.
[5] S.R.C., Dec. 22, 1753, n. 2427, ad 2; June 30, 1896, n. 3922, III, 1.
[6] *Ibidem*. [7] Appeltern, p. 137, n. 8.

(*a*) During *Septuagesima*, Gradual, Verse, Tract:

(*b*) During the Paschal Cycle, two *Allelujas* and two verses with an *Alleluja;*

(*c*) At any other time of the year, Gradual, Verse, two *Allelujas* and another verse.

2°. If the saint has no proper Mass, but his or her Mass is taken from the *Missae Communes*, then that *missa communis* is taken for the votive. If it have some *proper* parts, these must be used, *mutandis mutatis*, as above, No. **4**, 1°.

3°. Should it ever happen that a Mass is *ita propria*, that scarcely any part of it would be appropriate, except on the feast day, then for the votive Mass one is taken from the *communes*, according to the quality of the saint or saints.

5.—If the saints in whose honor a votive Mass is to be celebrated are not found in the *Proprium de Sanctis*, but in the *Appendices* of the Missal, then those priests who by special Indult are allowed to celebrate such Masses, must use that Mass *mutandis mutatis*, and all other priests must take a Mass from the *communes*, according to the quality of the saints. In such cases, if there are several formulas of Masses in the *commune sanctorum* and the Oration, Secret, Postcommunion, Epistle or Gospel of the *proper* corresponds to a special Mass among the *communes*, that Mass is to be celebrated.[8] If the saint's Mass is not contained in the Missal, any Mass according to the quality of the saint may be chosen.[9]

6.—If outside the Paschal season a votive Mass in honor of a martyr, whose feast occurs during the Paschal season and whose Mass during that season is one of the *communes*, is to be celebrated, such Mass proper of the Paschal season cannot be taken, but another must be selected of those *de commui Martyrum extra tempus paschale*, retaining the Epistle, Gospel, Oration, or whatever else may be proper.[10] As a rule the Oration or Gospel of the Mass *tempore paschali*, if it corresponds to the Oration or Gospel of the Mass *extra tempus paschale*, ought to be the guide in the selection of the Mass.[11] If, however, such a Mass is *proper*

[8] S.R.C., Sept. 11, 1841, n. 2839, ad 6.

[9] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 218.

[10] S.R.C., Sept. 11, 1841, n. 2839, ad 5.

[11] *Ibidem*, ad 6.

throughout and is appropriate also outside of the Paschal season, then that Mass may be used, but everything indicative of the Paschal season must be omitted. *E.g.*, Mass on the feast of St. Justin, Martyr, April 14th.[12]

Note.—On feasts of Martyrs which occur during the Paschal season in April and May, the Missal regularly indicates the Masses which must be used as a votive Mass *extra tempus paschale.*

7.—If during the Paschal season is to be celebrated a votive Mass of a Martyr whose feast occurs *extra tempus paschale*, it must be one of the *communes* of the Paschal season, but the parts *proper* of the feast must be retained.[13] If, however, the Introit is the only part proper of the festival it cannot be used.[14]

8.—If a votive Mass is to be celebrated in honor of several saints who are not joined together in the calendar and consequently have no common Mass on their day, the following rules are to be observed according to the latest liturgists:

(*a*) If they belong to the same category of saints, *i. e.*, all confessors, or martyrs, or virgins, etc., the votive must be *de communi*, but in the orations the plural number is used instead of the singular. This is the case even when one of them has an entirely *proper* Mass.

(*b*) If they belong to different categories, the votive Mass will be *de digniore*, but the orations should be such as would be suitable to all, or they may be taken from the Mass of St. Calixtus, October 14th.

(*c*) Sometimes, however, this will not be convenient. *E. g.*, a votive Mass is requested in honor of St. Joseph and St. Barbara for a happy death. In such a case celebrate the votive in honor of St. Joseph with the oration proper of the Saint, and after all the orations prescribed by the Rubrics add that of St. Barbara. If the number of the orations is then *equal* add another *ad libitum.*

(*d*) When a votive Mass is to be celebrated in honor of an individual saint who is associated in the Missal with one or more other saints, then if the context of the festival Mass in some parts

[12] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 219, 3°.

[13] S.R.C., November 29, 1738, n. 2340, ad 1.

[14] *Ibidem.*

is verified, that Mass can be selected, but the orations must be changed to the singular number and taken from the *commune*. *E. g.*, votive Masses in honor of St. Cyril, July 5th, will be *Sacerdotes*, with the orations in the singular number found in that Mass.

(*e*) But if everything in that Mass refers to many, the full Mass *de communi*, which suits the saint must be taken. *E. g.*, votive Mass of St. Sebastian, January 20th, will be *In virtute* or *Laetabitur*.

(*f*) If a votive Mass is requested in honor of a saint for a special object or reason, *e.g.*, in honor of St. Barbara for a happy death, then celebrate the Mass of St. Barbara, *mutandis mutatis*, and add the oration for the grace requested *quasi ad libitum* after all the orations prescribed by the rubrics.

9.—Votive Masses in honor of *St. Joseph* must always be the *Missa Votiva per annum, feria IV.*[15]

10.—*De Omnibus Sanctis* the votive Mass *extra tempus paschale* will be the Mass of the feast, November 1st, but the Introit will be *Timete* of the proper of SS. Cyriacus and Companions, August 8th, or *Sapientiam* of the Mass *de Communi plurimorum sanctorum*, but the first oration will be *Concede, quaesumus*, the first of the *orationes diversae*, found in the *sixth* part of the Missal. During the Paschal season it will not be of the feast, November 1st, but the *Sancti tui*, the *communis* of the Paschal season with the oration *Concede, quaesumus.*[16]

Note.—With regard to the *Missae votivae per annum* it must be noted:

1°. If the *Officium votivum per annum* was recited, the Mass will be celebrated *more festivo*, i. e., *cum Gloria*, etc.

2°. If the *Officium votivum per annum* was *not* recited, but of the ferial, vigil or simple feast, then the Mass corresponding to the *Officium votivum per annum* will be celebrated *more votivo*.

I.—(*b*) Mysteries.

11.—Besides these, in the *Proprium Sanctorum* you will find the following Masses, which may be celebrated as votive Masses,

[15] S.R.C., February 6, 1892, n. 3764, ad ix.

[16] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 221, 9°.

for they have special rubrics which indicate that they may be celebrated *more votivo*:

1°. *SS. Nominis Jesu* (II. Sunday after Epiphany);

2°. *Pretiosissimi Sanguinis D.N.J.C.* (I. Sunday of July);

3°. *SS. Cordis Jesu* (Friday after the Octave of *Corpus Christi*);

4°. *Sanctissime Redemptoris*, (October 23, or III. Sunday of July) in places in which by Indult this Mass may be celebrated;

5°. Instruments of the Passion, in places in which by Indult these Masses may be celebrated.[17]

12.—By *Missae de Mysteriis* are understood in a special manner:

1°. The Sundays and Ferials of the year;

2°. The principal mysteries of the Birth, Life, Passion, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ;

3°. Those which commemorate the principal dogmas of our Holy Faith;

The Mass of the Sundays and Ferials, to which may be added the Mass of Vigils, cannot be celebrated as votive Masses. The reason is evident, because they are allotted to certain peculiar seasons of the year, which order cannot be disturbed. A Mass of a Sunday in Advent would certainly not be appropriate in Lent, and *vice versa*.

Note.—A Mass of the Ferial in Lent, of the Ember days, or of a Vigil may be celebrated on those days, even when the *officium votivum per annum* was recited, but then a commemoration of the Office which was recited must be made,[18] because such Mass is celebrated *ritu simplici*, and admits a commemoration of the office.[19]

13.—Certain Mysteries of the Life and Resurrection of Christ are so restricted to certain times of the ecclesiastical year, *e.g.*, Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany, Resurrection, and Ascension, that their Masses cannot be celebrated at any other time. There is no chance of celebrating votive Masses in their honor. If such Masses are requested, the Mass of the day or that of the Blessed Trinity is celebrated with the intention of honoring the mystery.[20]

[17] Wapelhorst, n. 27, 3, d.

[18] S.R.C., Aug. 30, 1892, n. 3792, ad vii.

[19] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 223.

[20] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 224.

II.—Special Votive Masses.

14.—After the *commune Sanctorum* at the end of the Missal are found eight special votive Masses, viz:

(*a*) *De SS. Trinitate.* Immediately after the Mass there is a special rubric with regard to the *Missa pro Gratiarum actione*, for which the following Masses may be taken: *de SS. Trinitate*, or *de Spiritu Sancto*, or *de B. Maria*, to the orations of which Masses the oration for Thanksgiving, *Deus, cujus misericordiae*, is added *sub una conclusione*, in *solemn* votive Masses, but *after* the commemorations in *private* votive Masses.[21]

(*b*) *De Angelis.* For a votive Mass in honor of the Angels may be selected:

1°. The Mass *Benedicite*, noted in this place;

2°. The *Missa Votiva*, corresponding to the votive office of Monday;

3°. The Mass of St. Michael, September 29th;[22]

4°. The Mass of the Guardian Angels, October 2d;

5°. The Mass of St. Gabriel, March 18th, or of St. Raphael, October 24th, in places in which these Masses are allowed by Indult to be celebrated.[23]

15—(*c*) *De Sanctis Apostolis Petro et Paulo.*

1°. If a votive Mass is requested in honor of St. Peter or of St. Paul, individually, this Mass may be celebrated. During the Paschal season the Mass of St. Mark, April 25th, is taken, except the Orations, Epistle and Gospel which are taken from the *proper;* [Rubr. Miss. Spec. after this Mass].

2°. If the Mass is to be in honor of the Conversion of St. Paul, this same Mass may be celebrated, or the Mass of the Conversion of St. Paul, with a commemoration of St. Peter.[24]

3°. A votive Mass in honor of any of the other Apostles will be *mutandis mutatis* the Mass of the feast, except during the Paschal season, if the feast does not fall within that season, for then it will be of St. Mark with the Orations, Epistle and Gospel of the feast.[25]

[21] S. Liguori, lib. VI, n. 423, Advert. IV.

[22] See the rubric after the Mass *Benedicite.*

[23] Schober, App. iii, a. 2, (*b*).

[24] *Ibidem*, (*c*).

[25] Schober, *loc. cit.*

4°. The votive Mass of St. John, Apostle and Evangelist, will be, during the Paschal season, as on his feast *Ante Portam Latinam*, May 6th.[26]

5°. If outside of the Paschal season a votive Mass of an Apostle, whose feast occurs during the Paschal season, is to be celebrated, the votive Mass of SS. Peter and Paul is taken, with the orations, Epistle and Gospel of the feast,[27] except the votive Mass in honor of SS. Philip and James, May 1st, which will be the same as on the feast, but the *Alleluias* are dropped, and of St. Mark, April 25th, which will be that of St Luke, October 18th, with the orations, Epistle and Gospel of the feast.[28]

6°. A votive Mass in honor of *all the Apostles* will be the *Missa votiva de SS. Apostolis* of Tuesday, granted by Indult, July 5, 1883.[29]

16.—(*d*) *De Spiritu Sancto.* To implore the grace of the Holy Ghost this Mass is also celebrated, but the orations are those which are found after this Mass.[30]

(*e*) *De SS. Eucharistiae Sacramento.* This Mass is celebrated also at the Forty Hours' Devotion.[31]

(*f*) *De Cruce.* The *Missae propriae* of the Finding and of the Exaltation of the Cross cannot be celebrated as votive Masses. This Mass must be taken instead,[32] and during the Paschal season the first oration will be *Deus qui pro nobis*, found at the end of this Mass.[33]

(*g*) *De Passione D. N. J. C.* This Mass, or the preceding *Missa de Cruce*, is celebrated as a votive Mass in honor of the Instruments of the Passion in places in which the latter are not allowed by Indult to be celebrated.[34]

17.—(*h*) *De S. Maria.* There are five votive Masses in honor of the Blessed Virgin :

[26] Wapelhorst, n. 28, 2.

[27] Schober, *loc. cit.*

[28] *Rubr. Spec. Miss.* after the Masses on their feast days.

[29] Schober, *loc. cit.*

[30] *Rubr. Spec. Miss.* after the Mass.

[31] See THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, May, 1903. Votive Masses. Part II. Privileged. D. No. 11, et seqq.

[32] Schober, *loc. cit.* (*f*) ; Van der Stappen, Quaest. 226.

[33] Rubr. Gen. Miss., at the end of the Mass.

[34] Auctores passim.

1°. From the beginning of Advent to Christmas;
2°. From Christmas to the Purification;
3°. From the Purification to Easter;
4°. From Easter to Pentecost;
5°. From Pentecost to Advent.

With regard to these Masses we must note:

(*a*) If a votive in honor of the Blessed Virgin is to be celebrated, it must be the one assigned to that part of the year in which this Mass is celebrated;

(*b*) If a votive Mass of the Blessed Virgin is to be celebrated during an octave of the Blessed Virgin on a day on which the office of that octave is *not* recited, then the Mass will be *de octava*, but *more votivo;*[35] without *Credo* but with *Gloria* on account of the festival.[36]

(*c*) If, however, the office of the octave is recited, then the Mass must be *de octava*, but *more festivo;*[37]

(*d*) Masses proper of the feasts of the B. Virgin, *e. g.* Annunciation, Assumption, Nativity, etc., cannot be celebrated as votive Masses, except during the octaves of such feasts.[38] If a Mass is requested of these Mysteries not within their octaves, it must be one of the Masses treated above,[39] appropriate to the time at which this Mass is celebrated, with the intention of honoring these mysteries.[40]

Note 1.—There are three exceptions, *i. e.*, the Mass of the Seven Dolors (Friday after Passion Sunday in the *Proprium Sanctorum* after the feasts of March); of the Immaculate Conception; and *Purissimi Cordis B. M. V.* (Third Sunday after Pentecost) in places in which by Indult it is allowed to be celebrated.[41] This is also evident from the Missal, which indicates the variations in the Gradual and *Alleluja* after the Epistle, according to the time of the year in which the votive Mass is celebrated.

[35] S.R.C., January 26, 1793, n. 2542, ad 2.

[36] S.R.C., June 13, 1671, n. 1421, ad 2; Appeltern, *Manuale Lit.*, p. 134, footnote (8).

[37] *Ibidem.*

[38] S.R.C., February 23, 1884, n. 3605, ad V. 2.

[39] No. 17 (*h*); S.R.C., January 29, 1752, n. 2417, ad 6.

[40] Van der Stappen, De Rubr. Miss. Rom., Quaest. 211.

[41] S.R.C., Sept. 16, 1673, n. 1490, ad 2; Febr. 23, 1884, n. 3605, ad V. 1.

Note 2.—If these Masses are requested during the octave of another feast of the B. Virgin, the Mass of the octave is to be preferred.[42]

III.—Votive Masses for Various Purposes.

18.—These Masses are found in the Missal after the special votive Masses which are explained above.[43] A Rubric which precedes them says that they may be celebrated on any day, except Sunday or when a *duplex* Office is recited, but it adds immediately, "*sed tamen passim non dicantur, nisi urgenti de causa.*" They may be divided into the following classes:

1. For public ecclesiastical needs:

(*a*) *Pro eligendo Summo Pontifice, sede vacante.* Instead of this Mass the Mass *de Spiritu Sancto* may be celebrated;[44]

(*b*) *In anniversario Electionis seu Consecrationis Episcopi;*[45]

(*c*) *Contra paganos;*

(*d*) *Ad tollendum schisma.*

2. For public civil needs:

(*a*) *Tempore belli;*

(*b*) *Pro pace;*[46]

(*c*) *Pro vitanda mortalitate, vel tempore pestilentiae;*

3. For private spiritual needs: *pro remissione peccatorum;*

4. For private temporal needs: *Pro infirmis;*[47]

5. For particular private needs:

(*a*) *Pro sponso et sponsa;*[48]

(*b*) *Pro peregrinantibus;*

(*c*) *Ad postulandum gratiam bene moriendi;*

6. In any necessity, *pro quacumque necessitate*, public or private, spiritual. For the color of the vestments used at these

[42] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 213.

[43] *Vide supra* No. **14**, et seqq.

[44] *Rubr. Spec. Miss.*, before this Mass.

[45] See The Ecclesiastical Review, May, 1903, Privileged Votive Masses, G. No. **27**.

[46] See The Ecclesiastical Review, May, 1903, Privileged Votive Masses, D. Forty Hours' Devotion, No. **11**, et seqq.

[47] At the end of this Mass there are special orations for the dying.

[48] See The Ecclesiastical Review, May, 1903, Privileged Votive Masses, H. Nuptial Mass, No. **31**, et seqq.

Masses, see THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April, 1903, No. **9**, *et seqq.*

19.—Should any grave cause occur for which there is no special Mass assigned in the Missal, *e.g.*, for rain, clear weather, etc., the Mass *pro quacumque necessitate* is celebrated. If the Mass be a *solemn* votive the peculiar oration is added to the oration of this Mass *sub una conclusione;* if it be a *private* votive, the peculiar oration is recited after all the orations prescribed by the Rubrics, but before the *imperata.*[49]

S. L. T.

EXAMEN CUJUSDAM LIBELLI "DE CARENTIA OVARIORUM RELATE AD MATRIMONIUM."*

Scriptores principales hac de re agentes qui forsan consulantur sunt: Eschbach, *Disputationes Physiologico-Theologicae*, ed. 2, Romae 1901, opus omnibus numeris absolutum; idem, apud *Analecta Ecclesiastica*, de novo quodam sterilitatis conceptu, vol. 10, 1902, pp. 85 sq. ac deinceps interrupte; idem, apud *Nouvelle Revue Theol.*, t. 17, pp. 302 sq. et pp. 353 sq. Berardi, *Praxis Confessariorum*, ed. 3, Faventiae 1899, vol. 4, n. 799 sq. et pp. 646 sq.; idem *Casus Conscientiae*, 1892, pp. 22 sq. Gasparri, *De Matr.*, ed. 2, Paris 1892, n. 513 et 514. Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theol. Mor.*, 1902, *Supplem.* ad Tr. de Matr., n. 6. *Nouvelle Revue Theol.*, t. 20, pp. 83 sq., t. 26, pp. 287 sq.; t. 34, pp. 113 sq. (J. V.). Sili, *votum*, cui in causa Monaster., 1899, Emi Cardinales primas partes dederunt, apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 8, pp. 251 sq. REVIEW, vol. 27, pp. 609 sq. et p. 656; vol. 28, pp. 51 sq., pp. 149 sq., pp. 314 sq. (Lehmkuhl), pp. 351 sq., pp. 577 sq. Capellmann, *Pastoral-Medicin*, ed. 12, Aachen 1898, p. 188 sq. Antonelli, *De Conceptu Impotentiae et Sterilitatis*, Romae 1900; idem, *Pro Conceptu*, Romae 1901. Bucceroni, *Institutiones Theol. Mor.*, ed. 4, Romae 1900, vol. 2, n. 994 et 995; idem, *Casus Conscientiae*, ed. 4, Romae 1901, n. 146, 2. Leitner, *Lehrbuch des Kath. Eherechtes*, Paderborn 1902, pp. 153 sq. Villada, *Casus Conscientiae*, part 3, n. 89 sq. Rosset, *De Sacr. Matr.*, 1895, n. 1411 coll. n. 1406 sq. De Luca, *votum* in causa Monast. apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 8, pp. 246 sq.

CLARISSIMUS auctor supradicti libelli in sua praefatiuncula declarat, p. 3: "Perbrevi hoc libello duo moliri conati sumus: et doctrinam canonicam exponere, et animadversiones in thesim nostram illatas vel inferendas repellere." Etiam "*inferendas*": quoniam igitur cl. auctor suae partis argumenta his paginis

[49] Van der Stappen, Quaest. 231.

* "De Carentia Ovariorum Relate ad Matrimonium," N. Casacca, O.S.A. New York. Pp. 35.

exhausisse omniaque pro sua causa in medium protulisse videtur, jam liceat mihi argumentum theologi statera et rationis trutina examinare, ac secundum notas sanae rationis et theologiae Catholicae leges judicium de eo facere. Quod quidem puto neminem, neque ipsum cl. auctorem, in malam partem esse accepturum, quum casu fortuito, quamquam paene invitus, etiam egomet ad speciem libelli hujus efformandam nonnihil contulerim. Hisce autem nolo vel novam controversiam excitare, vel antiquam necopinato morbo mihi praecisam refricare, sed cogito tantum objective, uti ajunt, ratione theologica libellum istum examini critico subjicere criticumque de eo facere judicium, quod omni judici critico in suo saltem litterarum genere licitum esse nemo inficiabitur. Cl. auctor sine dubio lingua Latina bene utitur, neque verborum inopia laborat, atque ita multorum animos sibi devincit. Accedit quod prae se fert permagnam animi sinceritatem itemque amorem, reverentiam, pietatem vere laude dignam erga pristinum magistrum ac praeceptorem cl. Antonelli, cujus opinionem juvenili ardore et impetu defendit, quo abreptus non pauca decernit esse certissima ac vera, quae aliis viris doctis vix verisimilia videntur. Callet etiam artem conciliandi sibi speciem verisimilitudinis. Attamen illi, qui neque jurare in verba scriptoris neque primoribus tantum labris res degustare assoleant, sed, semota verborum turba, in altum descendant auctorisque argumenta scrutantes res a fontibus repetant, brevi reperient, auctorem non ab omni errato vel indiligentia sibi cavere, haud pauca male interpretari, textus ac verba theologorum adversariorumque non accurate referre, fallacibus et captiosis argumentis, licet bona fide, uti, verbis theologorum novam plane significationem subjicere: quare omnia ejus argumenta diligenter perpendere studebunt, neque assertis ejus fidem statim habebunt, nisi locis fontibusque ipsis penitius examinatis atque collatis. Jamvero res ipsas et facta loqui sinamus.

I.—Fundamentum: Sophisma.

Tota thesis auctoris juxta ipsum continetur hoc syllogismo p. 16 coll. pp. 10 et 29: "*Ex Ecclesia* invalide contrahit matrimonium qui impedimento impotentiae laborat; atqui *ex physiologia* mulier carens ovariis laborat impedimento impotentiae; ergo mulier *carens* ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere non potest."

Hoc est purum putumque *sophisma*. *Major* enim accipit terminum *medium*, scil. impedimentum impotentiae, *in sensu ecclesiastico*—"*ex Ecclesia*",—*Minor* contra *in sensu physiologico*—et quidem in sensu hausto "*ex physiologia*" a quibusdam "physiologistis etiam optimae notae"[1] in pravum detorta, aliis praecipue nostris physiologis ac legisperitis diserte contradicentibus.[2] Atqui sensus ecclesiasticus revera *est* ac *debet* esse *plane diversus* a sensu illo physiologico ab auctore allato. Ergo argumentatio haec continet quatuor terminos ac propterea est purum putumque sophisma.

1.—*Sensus ecclesiasticus in Majore* allatus eruitur ex legibus ac praxi Ecclesia et ex communi interpretatione theologorum.

a.—Ecclesia per jus canonicum[3] suum tamquam ad copulam maritalem potentes agnoscit virum, qui seminare potest intra vas mulieris, et mulierem, quae non est arcta viro, *neque aliud quidquam exigit*. Hinc Decretalium interpretes non aliam in feminis coeundi impotentiam intelligunt praeter arctitudinem.[4] Jus pontificium autem *numquam* loquitur de *commixtione seminum*, de quo theologi disputabant, sed de *commixtione sanguinis* in quôdam canone.[5] Vox: *sanguis* vero, teste S. Bonaventura,[6] generice pro quocumque corporis humore, qui a sanguine originem ducit, assumebatur. Atque fit haec commixtio "sanguinis," quando intra carnalem copulam semen viri in vase debito seu vagina normali mulieris accipitur, unde propriis feminae humoribus miscetur.[7] Et haec est *commixtio seminum* S. Thomae[8] aliorumque theologorum, et nihil aliud (pp. 18 et 21).

b.—Praeterea, idem patet ex processu ab Ecclesia ad impedimentum impotentiae probandum praescripto ejusque praxi per-

[1] De Becker, *De Spons. et Matr.*, p. 155.

[2] Supra pp. 52 et 53.

[3] Ut patet ex *titulis II. de desp. impub.; XIV. de consang. et affin.; XV. de frig. et maleficio.*

[4] Sanchez, *De Matr.*, L. 1, disp. 92, n. 1, 22, cum communi. Cf. cl. Sili apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 8, p. 253.

[5] Can. 18, caus. 27, qu. 2, quem nonnemo dubium reputat.

[6] *Sent.*, L. 3, Dist. 3, p. 1, Dub. 3. Ed. nov. Tom. III, p. 79.

[7] Cf. Eschbach apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 10, p. 315.

[8] Cf. S. Thom. 3, q. 31, a. 5, ad 3, et *Sent.*, L. 4, Dist. 41, q. 1, a. 1, q. 4, ad 2.

petua. Scil. hinc Ecclesia exigit inspectionem tantum organorum copulationis et tractat copulam tamquam factum copulantium sensibus pervium, quod per se,—independenter ab effectu praegnantiae saepe non habito,—semper a conjugibus juridice probari potest, juramento interposito. Inde vero Ecclesia numquam curat de occursu spermatis ad ovulum,—quae est occulta operatio naturae, et, secuta etiam copula perfecta, modo adest, modo deest; semper autem per se quamlibet effugit juridicam probationem.[9]

c.—Confirmatur constanti doctrina theologorum: nam, teste auctore p. 7, "*pro certo habebant*[10] generationem saltem possibilem, quotiescumque sexualis unio cum seminatione viri locum haberet."

Ergo, *sensus ecclesiasticus* impedimenti impotentiae est ex parte viri: *inhabilitas seminandi intra vas debitum mulieris*;—et ex parte mulieris: *sola arctitudo* et nihil aliud.

2.—*Sensus physiologicus omnino diversus est in Minore.*

a.—Cl. auctor manifesto requirit *potentiam generandi* ad essentiam copulae maritalis, ac propterea dicit, p. 20 coll. p. 8: "Impotentia *per se* generandi est impotentia coeundi coitu *maritali*," atque eodem loco appellat cl. Eschbachii definitionem coitus conjugalis "falsam" et alibi, p. 17: "inadaequatam," quia non includit illam, de qua loquitur, potentiam generandi. Atqui hic sensus a cl. auctore repudiatus praecise est *sensus ecclesiasticus* potentiae maritalis *hucusque traditus*, uti patet ex praedictis, et Ecclesia hucusque multa per saecula numquam postulavit *potentiam generandi*, sed tantum *potentiam copulandi maritaliter*. Ergo manifesto sensus *physiologicus* impedimenti impotentiae ab auctore allatus est omnino diversus a sensu ecclesiastico hucusque tradito.

b.—Asseverat auctoris antesignanus:[11] "Sanchez et plurimi cum eo errarunt circa necessaria ad prolem concipiendam; propterea falso docuerunt ad copulam perfectam sufficere, ut vir semen in vas femineum emittat. Nonne clare perspicitur quaestionem de modo generationis esse quaestionem physiologicam

[9] Cf. Sili, l.c., p. 255.

[10] Litterae cursivae sunt a me procuratae, item omnes litterae crassiores, quae deinceps compluribus locis reperientur.

[11] Apud Eschbach, *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 10, p. 138.

quae omnino effugit competentiam canonistae et theologi?"[12] Quod auctor p. 9 ita coarctat: "Physiologia, ad quam solam quaestio de potentia generandi pertinet."

Jamvero recte dicitur: Quaestio de *modo generationis* certissime est quaestio *physiologica* et *physiologorum*, et omnino effugit competentiam theologorum aut canonistarum atque etiam tribunalium Ecclesiae. Sed quaestio de *impedimento impotentiae* habet relationem ad *peccatum originale* et ad *Sacramentum Matrimonii*, et est quam maxime quaestio *ecclesiastica*,[13] et nullo modo potest effugere competentiam theologorum, canonistarum, tribunaliumque Ecclesiae,—effugit vero omnino competentiam *physiologorum*. Idcirco quaestio de *modo generationis* nullo pacto potest cadere in competentiam tribunalium Ecclesiae, nec pertinere ad quaestionem de impedimento impotentiae. Ac proinde sensus ecclesiasticus impedimenti impotentiae *necessario debet esse longe diversus* a sensu physiologico ab auctore allato.

II.—Ambiguitates.

1.—Auctor libelli constanter utitur vocabulo: *semen* quoad mulierem sensu prorsus diverso ac theologi superiores, id quod ipse quoque candide fatetur p. 22: "De caetero theologi antiqui non poterant de ovulis et ovariis loqui, cum neque eorum existentiam perspectam haberent." Et nihilominus sibi vindicat eorum dicta et argumenta, ut suum sensum seminis prorsus novum comprobet. Theologi superiores *utriusque* scholae (p. 21) omnes loquuntur de "semine" seu humore, qui pertinet ad *copulam perficiendam*, et, si reapse effundatur,—quod non semper fit,—**intra copulam perficiendam** effunditur. Auctor noster e contrario loquitur de "semine" seu materia, quam natura in muliere **post copulam jam completam seu perfectam** suppeditat,—quod saepe non fit,—ad *generationem* perficiendam.

2.—Auctor impotentiam ad copulam de se aptam ad generationem idem esse censet cum impotentia per se generandi. Theologi superiores semper absolute distinguunt impotentiam coeundi

[12] *Logice* deberet addere: Et propterea etiam Ecclesia per multa saecula erravit, quia eodem sensu ac Sanchez et universa schola impedimentum impotentiae intellexit, et numquam de *modo generationis* curavit in eo determinando.

[13] Eschbach, *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 10, p. 138.

maritaliter ab impotentia generandi. Dicit nimirum auctor, p. 20 coll. p. 8: "Impotentia coeundi maritaliter certissime implicat impotentiam generandi; sicut impotentia *per se* generandi est impotentia coeundi coitu *maritali.* Ast impotentia *per accidens* generandi non est impotentia neque coeundi neque *per se* generandi."

Horum tamen plura merito impugnari possunt. Etenim:

a.—Impotentia coeundi maritaliter certo non implicat necessario impotentiam generandi: potest enim generatio fieri etiam sine ulla copula, vel per affusionem seminis virilis ad os vaginae vel per fecundationem artificialem; et hoc quoque apud impotentes ad copulam maritalem. Casum conceptionis per solam seminis virilis ad os vaginae affusionem factae nuperrime ab alio perito medico Baltimorae repertum chirurgus ejusdem urbis insignissimus, paucis ante diebus, mihi enarravit.

b.—Peccat auctor *contra leges logicae*, quando scribit: "Impotentia *per se* generandi est impotentia coeundi coitu *maritali.* Ast impotentia *per accidens* generandi non est impotentia . . . coeundi." Nam, si verum est potentiam generandi pertinere ad essentiam coitus maritalis modo ab auctore explicato, tunc *logice* impotentia *per se* generandi est impotentia *per se* coeundi coitu maritali, et impotentia *per accidens* generandi est impotentia *per accidens* coeundi coitu maritali. Atqui utraque impotentia tum *per se* tum *per accidens* coeundi coitu maritali—utique antecedens et perpetua—est ejusdem speciei ac dirimit matrimonium. Ergo etiam utraque impotentia tum *per se* tum *per accidens* generandi eadem ratione est ejusdem speciei et dirimit matrimonium. Ac propterea, *juxta leges sanae logicae*, optimo jure dictum est:[14] "Cl. Doctor autem cum suo cl. duce Antonelli constituit discrimen revera tantum *accidentale*," scil. impotentiam generandi *majorem*—seu *per se*—in muliere ovariis *penitus orbata*, et *minorem*—seu *per accidens*—in vetula ovariis *omnino exsiccatis* praedita, vel saltem in sterili, simulque merito illi ex hoc capite de inconstantia arguuntur.

c.—Attamen omnino distinguenda est impotentia coeundi maritaliter ab impotentia generandi sive *per se* sive *per accidens*, cum omnibus theologis, quorum testis sit Schmalzgrueber:[15]

[14] Supra p. 52.

[15] In L. 4, tit. 15, n. 31.

"Sola impotentia ad copulam dirimit matrimonium, non vero impotentia ad generationem;"—et Coninck:[16] "Steriles, . . . si aliter potentes sint ad usum matrimonii, valide contrahunt; quia **nec generatio nec potestas generandi est de essentia matrimonii**;"—et Mastrius:[17] "Impotentia est inhabilitas perpetua ad consummandum matrimonium. . . . Non est ex eo praecise, quod alteruter conjugum aut uterque sint steriles, quia impotentia ad generandum seu ad prolificandum, dummodo adsit potentia ad copulam carnalem et seminationem, non est impedimentum dirimens, ut *omnes passim concedunt* cum Scoto; . . . et ubi est **certa impossibilitas ad bonum prolis**, tunc matrimonium est ibi in remedium, non in officium."

3.—Auctor vocabulo[18]: **sterilitas** semper utitur *sensu longe diverso* ac theologi superiores. Namque ipse notionem sterilitatis **restringit** ad solam impotentiam *per accidens* generandi, pp. 8, sq. 20, 23; e contrario theologi superiores notionem sterilitatis **extendunt** ad quamlibet impotentiam generandi sine ullo discrimine sumptam accipiuntque voces: *sterilitas* et *impotentia generandi* tamquam omnino *synonymas.* Cujus rei en tibi testes: (a) Sanchez[19]: "Alia est impotentia ad copulam, alia vero ad solam generationem, quae vocatur *sterilitas* . . . Impotentia perpetua ad copulam reddit irritum subsequens matrimonium . . . Haec est apud omnes certissima . . . Certissimum est sterilitatem nil obesse valori matrimonii"; (b) item Laymann[20]: "Impotentia alia est ad prolem generandam, quae *sterilitas* dicitur, et haec, si sola sit, nullum matrimonio impedimentum affert; alia vero est impotentia ad copulam carnalem, de qua haec assertio sit: Impotentia perpetua ad copulam perfectam dirimit matrimonium subsequens . . . Dixi *perfectam*, id est, quae fit cum effusione veri seminis in vas muliebre." (c) Similiter Vincentius de Justis[21]: "Impotentia ad matrimonium est duplex. Prima, quae *sterilitas* dicitur, efficit ut proles *generari non possit*, ex se tamen

[16] *De Sacr.*, Tom. 2, disp. 31, dub. 7, n. 86.
[17] *Disp. de Matr.*, qu. 5, n. 114.
[18] Litterae cursivae paene omnes sub hoc n. 3 me auctore sunt collocatae.
[19] *De Matr.*, L. 7, disp. 92, nn. 1 in fine, 2, 26.
[20] *De Imped. Matr.*, cap. 11, nn. 1, 3.
[21] *De Dispens. Matr.*, L. 2, c. 17, nn. 1, 2, 3.

matrimonium nec impedit nec dirimit, ut docent Sanchez, Guttier, Coninck, . . . Ratio est, quia *nec generatio, nec generandi potestas sunt de essentia matrimonii.*" Quare hoc sensu universae scholae per manus tradito accipienda sunt illa D. Bonaventurae[22] de *sterilibus natura vel arte factis;* pariter illa S. Off. diei 3 Febr. 1887, de muliere per utriusque ovarii excisi *defectum sterili effecta,*[23] seu sterilizata (p. 16).

4.—Auctor ipsam suam definitionem, scil. impotentia est inhabilitas ad copulam *per se* aptam ad generationem, cujus verba ex theologis deprompsit, sensu *longe diverso* ac theologi illi intelligit. Audiatur unus ex theologis, Amort[24]: "Impotentia est inhabilitas corporalis ad copulam carnalem *de se* ad generationem prolis idoneam.—Dicitur: *de se;* potest enim contingere *per accidens*, v. g. ob debilitatem spirituum seminalium in viro aut femina, vel ob *indispositionem matricis* in muliere, quod copula carnalis, etiam **perfecta**, hoc est, *per effusionem seminis in vagina* mulieris **completa**, non sit idonea ad generationem prolis." Ergo juxta theologos copula debet esse *per se, de se, ex se,* seu *suapte natura* apta ad generationem, quatenus est copula formaliter et opus humanum seu liberum, cibi *manducationis* instar; licet generatio quocumque demum modo sive *per se* sive *per accidens,* sive *naturaliter* sive *artificialiter,* sive *accidentaliter* sive *aliter* non sequatur tamquam opus naturae non-liberum, cibi *digestionis* instar. Hoc enim tunc evenit *per accidens* quoad copulam, quae tamquam copula antecedenter ad hoc accidens jam est id, quod est,—jam est *perfecta,* hoc est, per effusionem seminis in vagina mulieris *completa,* ac proinde *de se* seu *suapte natura* apta ad generationem. Hinc etiam, auctore p. 19 provocante, jure affirmari potest: Coitus maritalis, formaliter tamquam coitus, inter virum potentem et mulierem utroque ovario absolute carentem est *per se* aptus ad generationem, seu *essentialiter* completus et perfectus.

Theologi igitur verba: *per se, de se, ex se, suapte natura,* **restringunt ad solam copulam qua copulam.** Auctor e contrario cum patronis suis verba: *per se,* **extendit vel explicando transponit ultra copulam ad aptitudinem seu potentiam generandi,** et contra theologos docet: Impotentia *per se* ad *generationem* est impotentia ad *copulam*

[22] Supra p. 59 et infra. [23] Supra p. 317. [24] *De Matr.*, qu. 101.

de se aptam ad generationem; impotentia vero *per accidens* non item. Uno obtutu exhiberi potest differentia essentialis ac formalis inter sensum S. Alphonsi ac theologorum et sensum auctoris ita:

Sensus theologorum.	Sensus auctoris.
Copula per se, ex se, de se apta ad generationem = copula per se, ex se, de se, qua copula habens aptitudinem ad generationem.	Copula per se apta sive potius apta per se (p. 31) ad generationem = copula habens aptitudinem per se (sumptam) ad generationem.

Quae differentia non est mere abstracta et speculativa, sed concreta et practica. Quod probant viri *illi hypospadiae et epispadiae*, qui seminis meatum *in radice* virgae habent, ita quidem ut, licet copulantes, solum ad os vaginae mulieris semen effundant. Jamvero hi juxta communem sententiam Eschbachii aliorumque, quae confirmatur ex causa Monaster. de 16 Dec. 1899, sunt vere impotentes, etiamsi copulam exercere conentur cum muliere physiologice sana, et aliquando actualiter liberos gignant. Nam, licet habeant erectionem, vaginae penetrationem, et seminationem, non tamen habent *in*seminationem *intra* vaginam; ergo eorum copula, qua copula, non est perfecta seu completa, et sunt viri illi vere impotentes. At omnia auctoris criteria copulae *perfectae* seu *aptae ad generationem* (p. 7) plus quam satis verificantur. Etenim est *copula formalis, scilicet apta ad generationem* (p. 17), quae imo *actualiter* aliquando sequitur; *finis essentialis ejusdem* (*h. e. proles*) non solum *absolute*, sed etiam *actualiter sperari potest* (p. 8); *generatio* ordinarie *non sequitur ob aliquid accidentale* (ib.) scil. deviationem aperturae seminalis penis; ac generatio est non modo *radicaliter et physice* (pp. 6, 7, 30), sed etiam realiter et omnino possibilis; et aliquando revera nati sunt ex tali "copula" liberi. Cl. Eschbach, *Disp. Phys. Theol.*, p. 151, enarrat duo exempla, ubi unus paterfamilias hypospadias habuit quinque filios, alter duos, item in utroque casu hypospadias. Ergo juxta auctorem talis copula debet esse perfecta, quia sine dubio apta est ad generationem, et viri illi juxta eumdem vere potentes. *Cf.* etiam 2, a.

Audiatur de hac re cl. consodalis J. V.[25]: "Ignoscat cl.

[25] Apud *Nouv. Rev. Theol.*, tom. 34, p. 115.

Auctor[26] si invictam aestimavero sententiam communem, matrimonio scil. non obstare eos defectus qui virum non impediunt ab effusione seminis intra vas debitum, sed solam sterilitatem inducunt; isti enim defectus, quantumvis essentiales *relate ad generationem*, accidentales sunt *relate ad copulam*, et non impediunt consummationem *in potentia*, quae ex Auctore sufficit ad matrimonium, et quae non est nisi copula apta ad generationem *in quantum haec pendet a copula.* Haec sola potentia requiritur ad stabiliendum matrimonium, quod contrahi posse in remedium concupiscentiae, negative se habendo relate ad finem prolis, indubie credimus. Secus enim erraverit S. Officium matrimonia non prohibendo istarum mulierum quae utero ovariisque carentes, erant jure naturae ad generationem ineptae."

Definitio cl. Eschbachii ergo est omnino adaequata definitio impotentiae ad copulam de se aptam ad generationem, non vero profecto impotentiae generandi, utpote quae est substantialiter diversa.[27]

5.—Auctor p. 25 non dubitat, etsi bona fide, peccare *expressione falsi* et *suppressione veri* allegando textum S. Alphonsi.[28]

Textus citationis auctoris.	Textus genuinus.
" Valide contrahunt steriles, quia etsi SINT *impotentes* (per accidens) *ad generationem*, non tamen ad copulam, etc."	" Valide contrahunt steriles, quia etsi **sint impotentes** ad generationem, non tamen ad copulam; atque adeo sunt capaces omnis juris et obligationis matrimonii; et susceptio prolis, licet sit praecipuus, non tamen est unicus, **nec immediatus finis matrimonii.**"

Auctor igitur interposuit verba: *per accidens*, quod est expressio falsi, et omisit praesertim verba: "susceptio prolis non est unicus *nec immediatus finis matrimonii*," quod in casu est suppressio veri: quomodo enim posset illa verba rationabiliter explicare?

S. Alphonsus cum Busenbaum a.—dicit absolute: "Etsi *sint*

[26] Antonelli.

[27] Qui plura cupit argumenta, adeat Sili apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 8, p. 253 sq.

[28] *Theol. Mor.*, L. 6, n. 1095, Res. 2.

impotentes ad generationem, non tamen ad copulam," nec distinguit inter impotentiam per se vel per accidens generandi. Distinguit tamen cum omnibus auctoribus inter impotentiam ad generationem et impotentiam ad copulam.

b.—Affirmat susceptionem prolis *non* esse *immediatum finem matrimonii.* Quae omnia clare contradicunt auctori. Quodsi S. Alphonsus paullo inferius dicit: impotentia "est illa, propter quam conjuges non possunt copulam habere *per se* aptam ad generationem; unde, sicut validum est matrimonium inter eos, qui possunt copulari, esto *per accidens* nequeant generare, puta quia steriles aut senes, vel quia femina semen non retinet: ita nullum est matrimonium inter eos, qui nequeant consummare *eo actu, quo ex se* esset possibilis generatio,"—haec intelligit sensu, quo omnes alii theologi scholae universae intellexerunt, quos ceteroquin sequi gloriatur, scil. verba: *per se* restringit ad copulam solam, et si generatio *utcumque* non sequatur, hoc est omnino *per accidens* relate ad copulam jam ex se essentialiter completam. Quare Marc ejusve continuator, fidelissimus uterque S. Patris discipulus, recte interpretatur D. Alphonsum in hunc modum:[29] "Impotentia, quoad matrimonium, est inhabilitas ad copulam conjugalem per se aptam ad generationem.—Unde, impotentes non sunt steriles, aut senes, nec feminae quae utroque ovario et utero carent, vel susceptum semen non retinent; dummodo actum matrimonii perficere possint; etenim, *si nequeant generare, hoc est per accidens.*"

III.—Fons ultimus notionis: Physiologia depravata.

Verba vere aurea profert auctor p. 21 dicendo: "Cl. adversarius . . . pro conceptu *theologico* determinando citat homines laicos theologiae jejunos, quod frustraneum esse nemo non videt." Ibidem citabantur laici[30] non pro conceptu *theologico* determinando, sed ad refellendos laicos ab auctore p. 14 prius allegatos. Imo ipsa illa praeclara ejusdem ratio omnino quadrat in auctoris opinionem.

1.—Nam *Minor* sophismatis auctoris p. 16 hoc asserit: "Atqui ex physiologia mulier carens ovariis laborat impedimento impoten-

[29] *Inst. Mor. Alph.*, ed. 10, n. 2008. Litterae cursivae sunt a me procuratae.

[30] Supra pp. 52 et 53.

tiae,"—cui addendum, i. e. ex physiologia a modernis physiologis prave detorta.

2.—Praeterea p. 5 scribit auctor[31]: "**Physiologia** . . . contrahentes physice aptos vel ineptos ad generandum **declarat.**" Et paullo inferius p. 6: "Hinc fit, ut *ecclesiasticae doctrinae principia*, quamvis in se immutabilia, *diversimode* tamen applicentur *diversis temporibus, propter diversitatem factorum ab ipsis peritis viris* determinatorum."

3.—Laudat p. 15 Parochum et Episcopum, "qui *chirurgi* exigit attestationem, qua constet physice impossibilem non esse generationem, attenta ratione, qua illa ovarii excisio perfecta est."

Quibus perpensis, sequitur auctorem cogi *ultimam rationem* opinionis suae *theologicae* haurire *ex physiologia* eaque depravata, "ad quam **solam** quaestio de potentia generandi pertinet," p. 9.—Quae tota argumentatio auctoris etiam alio vitio cumulata est, quod optime exponit Eschbach[32] dicendo: "Totius praesentis disputationis cardo et fundamentum in hoc sistit, utrum conjugalis impotentia, quae matrimonia dirimit, cum physiologica convertatur impotentia ad generationem efficaciter perficiendam, vel cum sola impotentia ad copulam tribus saepe a nobis repetitis constantem: erectione scilicet, debiti vasis penetratione atque intra idem seminis effusione. Quamdiu itaque ad solvendum dubium in explanandis haeres melius notis physiologiae legibus, nihil conficis; imo in petitione versaris principii, cum id plane supponas, de quo quaeritur.—Ulterius magnum generationis opus minime in hoc perficitur, quod ovulum et sperma commisceantur et novus homo concipiatur, sed ad ulteriora se extendit, cum nisi per debitos menses conceptus in materno sinu foveatur, atque, ad maturitatem perductus, vivus edatur, nihil praecedentia prosunt, neque generatio habetur in suo esse completo a natura volito. Hoc posito, impotentia conjugalis ad praegnationis etiam et ad partus inaptitudinem extendenda foret. Unde utique quidam apud Sanchezium[33] ajebant: 'Cum actus conjugalis sit propter prolem, si mulier sit proli edendae inepta, absque vitae periculo, erit matrimonio incapax.' Hoc tamen nemo

[31] Litteris cursivis a me procuratis.

[32] *Disp. Physiol. Theol.*, p. 163 sq.

[33] *De. Matr.*, L. 7, disp. 92, n. 27, quorum opinionem ipse Sanchez probabilem censet.

amplius admittit. Quid hisce ex solis inspectis physiologicis legibus respondeant, non video. Ad alios fontes recurrere ipsa res nos cogit."

Quid de procedendi ratione auctoris aliorumque sentiat, ita nervose enuntiat cl. De Becker:[34] "Dum praestat scientiis naturalibus progressuique moderno suum legitimum agnoscere locum, cavendum est ne recepta jamdiu in scholis catholicis principia deserantur. Libenter igitur harum disciplinarum investigationes novaeque observationes recipiuntur ex quibus reformandae sane sunt nonnullae notiones[35] a veteribus nobis traditae. At intolerabile prorsus esset praetendere genuinam de impotentiae impedimento indolem fuisse saeculis anteactis incognitam, omnesque D.D. Catholicos ipsaque tribunalia ecclesiastica constanter errasse quoad naturam hujus impedimenti."

IV.—Alia errata indiligentiaeque exempla.

Haec claritatis gratia, numeri ordine notantur, ipsis quidem auctoris verbis, ne quis forte error subrepat.

1.—"Perlegat ill. adversarius L. 6, n. 1095, ubi S. Alphonsus ita loquitur: Impotentia in femina esse censetur, quando vel seminare non potest, *si verum est semen feminarum requiri ad generationem*," p. 18.

Ad 1.—Toto animo amplectenda sunt verba haec D. Patris Alphonsi ac Busenbaum. Scil. **si** humor ille, qui ordinarie secernitur a glandulis femineis **intra ipsam copulam**, et **quem solum** intellexerunt auctores illi cum schola universa,[36] revera necessarius esset ad generationem,—de qua necessitate antiqui inter se disputabant,—tunc adesset impotentia in femina, quando seminare non posset; quia copula tunc, tamquam copula, non esset *de se* seu *suapte natura* apta ad generationem. Attamen hic humor femineus certissime non est necessarius ad generationem, uti nunc scimus. Ergo ejusmodi femina non est impotens, ac valde scite dixit S. Alphonsus cum Bus.: "*Si verum est semen* feminarum requiri ad generationem." *Ovulum* femineum certo necessarium est ad generationem, quatenus est *opus naturae post* copulam perfectam, sed nullo modo necessarium est ad copulam qua talem,

[34] *De Spons. et Matr.*, p. 155.

[35] *Physiologicae.*

[36] Supra heic sub II, 1.

de se aptam generationi, quatenus est opus liberum maritale. Ac proinde omnia, quae auctor, pp. 7, 22, latius disserit, versantur extra rhombum, quia pertinent ad *generationem* qua talem, non ad *copulam* de se generationi aptam.

2.—"Adferat ill. adversarius, si valet, testimonium ex S. Thoma, ex S. Alphonso, vel ex aliquo magnae notae theologo seu Canonista, qui clare et explicite affirmet, coitum *per se* ineptum ad generationem sufficere ad matrimonium validum constituendum," p. 19.

Ad 2.—Nulla prorsus est necessitas ut huic auctoris provocationi satisfiat, cum omnino teneat "adversarius," de quo hic agitur, coitum *per se* ineptum ad generationem **non sufficere** ad matrimonium validum constituendum, at sensu *theologico* a schola ecclesiastica universa acceptato,[37] non vero sensu *novo* ab auctore explicato, de quo supra satis.

3.—"Quoniam ovulum feminae ejusdem omnino necessitatis sit ac semen hominis; sequitur ad coitum maritalem ovaria necessario requiri," p. 20 coll. p. 10.

Ad 3.—Heic auctor provocat ad solas humanae generationis leges physiologicas, in quibus si sistimus, nihil efficimus; quia in petitione principii versamur.[38] Omnes quidem ultro concedimus ovulum feminae ejusdem suo modo necessitatis esse ac semen viri **ad generationem**, denegamus vero esse ejusdem necessitatis **ad copulam maritalem, qua copulam**, quia ovuli feminei cum semine virili conjunctio (conceptio) numquam fit *intra* copulam, neque *statim* post copulam, sed saepe saepius pluribus horis vel etiam diebus post: ergo copula de se jam est perfecta antea.

4.—"Cl. adversarius miratur in Dissertatione nostra nullam inveniri responsionem ad *valde doctam* et *gravem* opinionis nostrae *refutationem*, quam profert cl. Eschbach. Et nos e contra miramur ipsum *coctum recoquere*, cum in toto articulo repetat argumenta cl. Eschbach, quae cl. Antonellius Romae duobus editis opusculis in nihilum redegit. Unde clariss. De Luca post disputationem inter Eschbach et Antonellium justissime judicavit: 'Antonellius Rev.mum P. Eschbachium *palmarie* refutat.' De caetero neque scopus Dissertationis nostrae, neque natura illorum argumentorum, jam refutatorum, requirebant quod ab adversario desideratur," p. 21.

[37] Supra heic sub II, 3.

[38] Supra heic sub III, 3.

Ad 4.—a.—Hoc argumentum pariter laborat petitione principii et potest illud apte retorqueri in auctorem, hoc modo: Et nos e contra miramur ipsum *coctum recoquere*, cum in toto articulo repetat argumenta cl. Antonellii, quae cl. Eschbach Romae tum libro tum dissertatione prolixa in nihilum redegit. Unde cl. confrater J. V. de victoria Antonellii saepius depraedicata ita justissime judicat:[39] " Le chapitre *de impotentia* est remplacé par la nouvelle *disputatio II: de matrimoniali consummatione et conjugali impotentia.* Le savant Auteur[40] qui a maintes fois traités ces importantes questions devant les tribunaux ecclésiastiques de Rome, les a magistralement développées ici; *ces récents adversaires sont réfutés péremptoirement*, à notre avis."

b.—De caetero argumenta, quae tanti aestimantur a viris doctis communiter, semper sunt refutatione digna, et quaelibet de hac re dissertatio, quae hoc saltem paucis facere omittit, merito habetur suspecta.

5.—" Cl. adversarius adserit S. Alphonsum docere '*matrimonium subsistere posse* TANTUMMODO propter sedandam concupiscentiam, exclusa etiam *possibilitate* illius finis primarii,' et ad hoc probandum citat L. 6, n. 882, *magis versus finem.* Veniam petimus a cl. adversario, si dicere cogimur ipsum hic non retulisse doctrinam S. Alphonsi, qui in eodem loco ita loquitur: 'Ad rationem autem contrariae sententiae; nempe quod sit deordinatio *eligere* finem secundarium prae primario; respondetur, quod deordinatio quidem esset si ordinaretur finis primarius ad secundarium, sed non si ex *duobus* finibus licitis secundarius prae primario *eligatur.*' Ex hisce verbis clarissime patet S. Alphonsum non solum non excludere finem primarium, quando adserit licere, tantum ad vitandam incontinentiam, matrimonium inire; sed ipsum supponere; secus enim non haberetur *electio* finis secundarii prae primario; electio enim saltem inter duo esse debet," p. 25.

Ad 5.—a.—Auctor falso significat loco citato[41] ad hoc probandum allegatum esse *tantum* L. 6, n. 882. Ibidem[42] etiam allegatur L. 6, n. 1095 Res. 2. ad probandum matrimonium post lapsum, juxta S. Alphonsum, *magis immediate* concessum esse in remedium, adeo ut, *exclusa* etiam *possibilitate* prolis, ob remedium possit iniri.

b.—S. Alphonsus verbis ex L. 6, n. 882 ab auctore citatis respondet ad objectionem de liceitate electionis illius, non de validi-

[39] *Nouv. Rev. Theol.*, tom. 34, 1902, p. 114. [40] Eschbach.
[41] Supra p. 54. [42] Per notam 18, scil.: *Cf. supra sub 3*, ibidem subjectam.

tate, quam jam antea eodem numero clare pronuntiavit, ut mox dicemus;—et ponit quasi quoddam generale principium: non esse *deordinationem*, si ex *duobus* finibus licitis secundarius prae primario eligatur.

c.—Quot qualesque sint ex sententia S. Doctoris fines matrimonii, in principio ejusdem L. 6, n. 882 sine ullis ambagibus declarat. "*Fines intrinseci essentiales* sunt duo: traditio mutua cum obligatione reddendi debitum, et vinculum indissolubile. *Fines intrinseci accidentales* pariter sunt duo: procreatio prolis et remedium concupiscentiae. *Fines* autem *accidentales extrinseci* plurimi esse possunt, ut pax concilianda, voluptas captanda, etc. His positis, *certum est* (1) quod, si quis contraheret, positive excludendo *fines intrinsecos substantiales* matrimonii, nempe animo non reddendi debitum vel contrahendi ad tempus, non solum peccaret, sed nullum iniret matrimonium; ita communiter omnes cum *D. Thoma. Certum est* (2) quod, si quis *excluderet duos fines intrinsecos accidentales*, non solum **valide**, sed etiam licite posset quandoque contrahere; prout si esset senex et nuberet **sine spe procreandi prolem**, nec intenderet remedium concupiscentiae; sufficit enim, ut **salventur fines substantiales**, ut supra."

Ex hisce S. Alphonsi verbis liquent haec:

(1) Non *duos* tantum, sed *plures* S. Doctor assignat fines matrimonii; (2) tum procreatio prolis tum remedium concupiscentiae sunt tantum fines intrinseci *accidentales*, qui possunt **valide excludi**, e. g., ubi nulla adest spes procreandi prolem, nec remedium intenditur,—a fortiori potest *valide* excludi sola procreatio prolis, quia sunt tantum fines *accidentales;* (3) validum est matrimonium, etiamsi *nulla* sit *spes* procreandi prolem; (4) omnino sufficiunt ad *valorem fines intrinseci essentiales seu substantiales*, scil. traditio mutua cum obligatione reddendi debitum, et vinculum indissolubile.

d.—L. 6, n. 1095, Res. 2, igitur Sanctus cum Busenbaum jure merito declarat validum esse matrimonium, licet adsit *impotentia ad generationem*, dummodo adsit potentia ad copulam; quia tales contrahentes "sunt capaces omnis juris et obligationis matrimonii; et susceptio prolis, licet sit praecipuus, *non* tamen est *unicus nec immediatus finis matrimonii.*"

6.—"Cl. adversarius animadvertens in aliud argumentum nostrum, quo demonstravimus carentiam ovariorum esse carentiam rei, contractui matrimoniali *essentialis;* unde matrimonium cum tali muliere est invalidum, tamquam si celebretur sub conditione in pactum deducta vitandae prolis; citat S. Bonaventuram, qui loquens de hac re distinguit inter carentiam sive absentiam prolis naturalem et artificialem; et adserit contractum matrimonialem posse esse *sine* prole et *contra* prolem. Si est contra prolem, est invalidum matrimonium; si est sine prole, est validum. Hoc autem *sine* prole intelligendum est in sterilibus et in continentibus, ut ait S. Bonaventura; non autem in casu de femina ovariis penitus orbata, quae non est sterilis, sed impotens. Et si sensus verborum non esset iste, illa verba plus nimio probarent, et essent falsissima. Unde citatio illa ex S. Bonaventura *Opera omnia, Tom. IV, p. 720,* non est ad rem," pp. 27 et 28, coll. p. 12.

Ad 6.—a.—Auctor heic, uti etiam p. 12, plane confundit **consensum matrimonialem** cum re essentiali contractus matrimonii seu **objecto substantiali consensus matrimonialis.** Consensus matrimonialis[43] est actus voluntatis tradentis-acceptantis jus in corpus in ordine ad prolem generandam et educandam perpetuum, exclusivum, sacrum. Res vero essentialis seu objectum substantiale hujus consensus contractum matrimonii constituentis est idem illud jus in corpus, quod per consensum mutuo traditur-acceptatur. Atqui consensus seu actus voluntatis evidenter non est idem ac objectum suum seu jus in corpus. Ergo quod valet de consensu, non necessario valet de ejus objecto. Jamvero certo, juxta omnes, quaelibet conditio contra rem essentialem seu objectum substantiale plene integreque sumptum, tamquam *conditio sine qua non* **consensui matrimoniali** attentato annexa, ipso facto irritat istum consensum; quia eo ipso, quod jus ita limitat ac retinet, excludit verum consensum in absolutum jus matrimoniale, quod jus D. Paulus 1, Cor. 7, 4 ita explicat: "Mulier sui corporis potestatem non habet, sed vir. Similiter autem et vir sui corporis potestatem non habet, sed mulier." Tali enim consensu ementito contrahentes non traderent-acceptarent sibi mutuo hoc reale dominium seu potestatem corporis, qualiscumque in rerum natura, modo sit sufficiens, existit. E contra **objectum substantiale consensus** matrimonialis seu jus in corpus in ordine ad prolem perpetuum, exclusivum, sacrum potest esse in conditione magis perfecta,

[43] Cf. Gasparri, *De Matr.*, n. 771 sq.

ut in fecundis feliciterque parituris et educaturis, et minus perfecta vel etiam manca, ut in fecundis sed non feliciter parituris educaturisve, et a fortiori in sterilibus; vel potest quoque quasi perimi v. gr. ab illis contrahentibus, qui de facto intendunt evitare generationem, aut procurare abortum, aut non servare fidem. At **talis conditio aut intentio non essentialiter vitiat objectum** substantiale consensus matrimonialis. Non enim stricte loquendo ad objectum substantiale salvandum requiritur, ut proles revera generetur vel educetur, imo neque ut habeatur *potestas* prolem *generandi* vel *educandi*, sed tantum requiritur et sufficit, ut adsit potentia ad copulam de se, qua copulam, aptam ad generationem, quatenus generatio a copula ipsa pendet: sicque hujusmodi copula de se habet *essentialem ordinem* seu relationem ad prolem. Et hoc modo *essentialiter* salvatur objectum substantiale matrimonii, etiamsi *absoluta* impotentia generandi de industria procuretur,—quamvis quidem integra perfectione sua careat: quia semper manet jus in corpus in ordine ad prolem perpetuum, exclusivum, sacrum; et si proles non generetur vel educetur, hoc est omnino per accidens relate ad copulam de se generationi aptam. Auctor quoque sibi ipse contradicere cogitur. Nam e. g. recte admittit valorem matrimonii sterilium; at ex principio suo heic posito hunc valorem negare debet, quia *conditio sterilitatis procurandae* etiam invalidat consensum.

b.—S. Bonaventura loco citato[44] aperte loquitur inter alia de sterilibus **arte** factis, respondendo ita ad partem objectionis sibi propositae asserentis "quod qui venena sterilitatis procuraverint non sunt conjuges." Atqui procurare venena sterilitatis, ita ut conjuges sint *arte* steriles, seu impotentes ad generationem, quod S. Bonaventura cum antiquis hic supponebat, certo est *contra prolem*,—sed *nondum* est *contra consensum* matrimonialem, qui facit matrimonium. Ac S. Bonaventura aperte declarat etiam hanc impotentiam generandi artefactam non obstare valori matrimonii ex parte objecti consensus, dummodo non *sub tali pacto consentiatur* ex parte voluntatis, ut prolis sterilitas procuretur.

c.—Et idem clarissime edicit S. Alphonsus cum Busenbaum:[45]

[44] Supra p. 50.

[45] *Theol. Mor.*, L. 6, n. 881, 5. Cf. etiam quae Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Mor.*, II, nn. 687, 688, 689 de hac re praeclare disserit, unde facile complentur ejusdem dicta supra p. 317.

"Valide, sed illicite contrahitur cum *intentione negandi debitum, vitandi prolem*, vel *etiam non educandi*, moechandi etc., nisi tamen talis intentio in pactum deducatur, id est, nisi adjiciatur tamquam conditio obligans ad aliquid contrarium essentiae matrimonii." Plura ex his certissime sunt contra prolem, et nihilominus etiam expressa intentio eorum non obstat valori matrimonii, nisi in pactum deducatur sensu explicato. Hoc sensu quoque sine ulla dubitatione accipienda sunt verba S. Thomae: "Intentio prolis est essentialissimum in matrimonio" (pp. 28 et 24), ut legenti integrum textum Angelici clare patebit.[46] Ergo etiam orbatio ovariorum alicujus feminae, quamvis sit *contra* prolem, non est tamen contra consensum matrimonialem, nisi eodem modo declarato in pactum deducatur.[47]

d.—Ex his etiam liquet, quid sit judicandum de palmari argumento auctoris aliorumque, p. 24 coll. p. 7, scil.: "Matrimonium essentialiter conjunctio in ordine ad prolem est (*saltem in potentia per se*)," nempe ad generationem.

Etenim dicendum est cum S. Thoma[48] et schola universa: "Matrimonium est contractus quidam, quo unus alteri obligatur ad debitum carnale solvendum; unde, sicut in aliis contractibus non est conveniens obligatio, si aliquis se obliget ad hoc, quod non potest dare aut facere, ita non est conveniens matrimonii contractus, si fiat ab aliquo qui debitum carnale solvere non possit; et hoc impedimentum vocatur impotentia coeundi." Juxta S. Thomam ergo scholamque universam, "matrimonium est contractus quidam, quo unus alteri obligatur ad debitum carnale solvendum." Hic est finis intrinsecus essentialis contractus matrimonialis, in ordine ad prolem, quae est finis intrinsecus tantum accidentalis, sine quo igitur essentia matrimonii plene constare potest;[49] simulque definitio cl. Eschbachii copulae perfectae probatur omnino consentanea verae doctrinae D. Thomae.

e.—Hinc quoque patet, quid sit censendum, de nota auctoris, p. 7:

[46] Supra p. 59.

[47] Et ita interpretanda sunt verba Cl. Eschbach apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 10, p. 497 sub I, nisi velis integram ejus sententiam radicitus pervertere. Cf. etiam Lehmk., supra p. 322.

[48] *Sent.*, L. 4, Dist. 34 a. 2. *Suppl.*, q. 58., a. 1.

[49] Cf. S. Alph., supra heic sub 5, c.

" . . . denegamus aliquem posse matrimonium *contrahere* sedationemque concupiscentiae intendere, cum actus coniugalis perfectus pro fine primario, seu actus generativus, sit in utraque vel in alter-utra parte radicaliter ac physice impossibilis."

Nam copula perfecta, qua vir vaginam normalem feminae penetrando in vaginam semen verum effundit, est copula de se, i. e., qua copula, apta ad generationem, *quatenus generatio pendet a copula.* Ideoque actus generativus, *quatenus pendet a copula*, est in copula memorata semper non solum "radicaliter ac physice," sed etiam *expedite* et *realiter* seu perfecte ac complete possibilis, quia adsunt omnia elementa essentialia generationis, quae copula ipsa qua copula ex lege naturae suppeditare debet. Imo generatio, *in quantum pendet a copula*, *debet* esse *realiter* et *expedite* (perfecte) possibilis: secus copula de se non esset vere apta ad generationem.

7.—Cl. adversarius adserit quatuor Decisiones ex S. C. Concilii a nobis allatas confirmare opinionem eius; quatenus in illis quatuor casibus mulier semper carebat *vase* debito pro coitu. Hic discimus adversarium habere pro vase debito coitus, *non generativi*, non solum vaginam, sed etiam uterum! Ad memoriam ipsius tamen revocamus etiam in casu a S. Congr. S.O. die 30 Julii 1890 deciso, mulierem passam fuisse ablationem uteri, quem ipse vas debitum putat; et nihilominus S. Congr. respondit: 'Matrimonium non esse impediendum,' " p. 28.

Ad 7.—Mira sane conclusio auctoris, quam nec fieri posse credidisses, nisi heic typis impressam tuis oculis perlustrasses!

Dixit adversarius, de quo heic agitur:[50] " In istis mulieribus, quae a S. Congregatione Concilii impotentes declaratae sunt, semper *defuit vas debitum, ergo potentia coeundi.*" Non dixit:[51] *vasa* debita; non dixit: *vas indebitum*, sed dixit: *vas debitum*, putans quemlibet intellecturum esse, quid hoc sibi vellet. Certissime *vas debitum mulieris* significat *solam vaginam normalem*, seu idoneam ad copulam secundum leges naturae perficiendam, *et nihil aliud.* Sane ipsa haec vagina normalis defuit in *omni* casu ab auctore pp. 12 et 13 allato mulierum illarum, quas S. Congre-

[50] Supra p. 59.

[51] Neque l. c., neque alibi, neque praesertim in definitione. Injuria ergo auctor oppugnat eum e.g. p. 20, acsi potuerit significare copulam sodomiticam, quippe quae fit—venia sit dicto!—in mulieris vase praepostero seu ano, qui longe certissime non est *vas debitum* actus conjugalis!

gatio Concilii impotentes declaravit. Et hic defectus vaginae normalis satis superque sufficiebat ad impotentiam constituendam, quia idcirco non aderat potentia coeundi, quamquam *insuper* accedebat defectus uteri, qui impotentiam ex defectu vaginae normalis jam constitutam nihil immutavit immutatve. E contrario mulier, de qua in Decreto S. Officii de die 30 Julii 1890, retinuit vaginam suam, ergo etiam potentiam coeundi. Sed taedet tam evidentia longius prosequi.

8.—"Uti patet, nos comparationem instituentes inter nostram et oppositam sententiam, hanc coniugibus ansam pro onanismo committendo praebere adseruimus; et hoc etiam in hypothesi de validitate matrimonii cum muliere castrata; unde non diximus copulam illam esse obiective onanisticam, quod erat demonstrandum; sed *viam* onanismi crimini *aperire*. Deterriti detestabilibus delictis, quibus in magnis praesertim civitatibus, ex medicorum confessione feminae tam multae abscissionem ovariorum arte sibi procurant ad prolem vitandam, vel ad indulgendum impune passionibus effrenatis; deterriti malis, quorum ferax est illa sententia tum contra pacem domesticam, tum contra singulos homines et contra societatem, nos iterum atque iterum clamabimus: sententia, quae tenet mulieres penitus carentes ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere posse, non solum onanismi crimini viam aperit, sed societatem ac familiam turbat ac irreparabiliter offendit. Ita ut, etiam in hypothesi quod carentia ovariorum non sit impedimentum dirimens matrimonium *de iure naturae*, desiderandum esset ut summus Pontifex tale impedimentum constitueret *de iure ecclesiastico*," pp. 28 et 29; coll. p. 14. Conferat benevolus lector hunc locum cum eodem loco supra p. 161, et reperiet cl. auctorem caute omisisse in libello, sine omissionis indicio, hanc magni momenti clausulam suam: "De caetero in hypothesi de veritate sententiae nostrae, quod nos propugnamus, copula illa esset revera onanistica."

Ad 8.—a.—Non affirmatur loco impugnato, supra pp. 60 sq.: Cl. Doctor *dicit* copulam illam esse objective onanisticam, sed: "argumentum laborat falso **supposito**," atque auctor pleno ore confirmavit hoc esse suppositum opinionis suae, dicendo supra p. 161: "*De caetero* **in hypothesi** *de veritate sententiae nostrae, quod nos propugnamus, copula illa esset revera onanistica.*" Hypothesis enim est verbum graecum significans *suppositum*. Ipse auctor igitur clarissime demonstravit, quod erat demonstrandum. Quam ob causam, opinor, ista sunt in libello omissa.

b.—Quod vero attinet ad ejus dicta, scil. "etiam in hypothesi de validitate matrimonii cum muliere 'castrata,'" . . . melius

sterilizata, sententiam cl. Eschbachii "*viam* onanismi crimini *aperire*," —jam pluribus loco citato demonstratum est, nimium sine dubio probare ista; quia sunt argumenta *ex abusu* desumpta, et saltem pari modo urgeri possunt contra res legesque vel sanctissimas, imprimis etiam contra ipsum Sacramentum Matrimonii: id quod jam per se ostendit, argumenta illa esse plane inepta et absurda. Idem suo modo egregie probat Lehmkuhl.[52]

c.—Quoad medicos, qui testari perhibentur de delictis feminarum ad fines pessimos abscissionem ovariorum sibi procurantium, —certissime ipsi illi medici, qui nulla cogente necessitate, exsectionem ovariorum procurando, feminis illis pessimis morem gerunt, sunt nefarii delicti, violati officii, fidei fractae rei, vere improbi infamesque, omnibus viribus corripiendi, damnandi, puniendi.

d.—Quoad delicta autem et mala, quorum dicitur ab auctore sententia cl. Eschbachii esse ferax, retorqueri potest argumentum: Auctoris opinio, si in praxim deduceretur, sine necessitate utilitateve, contra doctrinam praximque hucusque traditam, multiplicaret matrimonia invalida ac delicta concubinatu pejora, neque tamen mulieres pessimas, quae auctori ob oculos versantur, efficaciter coerceret; nam omni, qua possent, ope ad prolem vitandam libidinemque carnis satiandam nitentes, aut, spretis legibus, abscissionem ovariorum nihilominus subirent nuberentque, aut alias nefandas propositi consequendi rationes invenirent;—neque cohiberet viros, qui ejusmodi praecise mulieres per fas et nefas sibi quaerendas statuerent;—neque ullo modo apud tales veri onanismi crimini viam occluderet, imo oleum flammae adderet;—multos, praeterea, qui ob fidem in magnis praecipue urbibus collapsam, omni lege posthabita, in tali matrimonio perstarent, sacramentis valedicere, in peccatis suis tabescere, fidei salutisque aeternae naufragium facere cogeret;—sortibus deinde sequioris sexus, praesertim miserarum illarum, quae dira vitae servandae necessitate compulsae vel etiam insciae invitaeve excisionem ovariorum evitare nequirent, male prospiceret; ac proinde et singulos et familiam et societatem et Ecclesiam turbaret et irreparabiliter offenderet. Auctor vero ipse, quod pejus est, juxta notas suas p. 10 et p. 23, multas vetulas ex sola senectute desiccatas a matrimonio ineundo, vel inito utendo arceret omniaque dubiis repleret: in quibus dubiis ipse sibi con-

[52] Supra p. 322.

tradiceret, cum ex una parte doceret obligationem "sequendi sententiam tutiorem, quotiescumque agitur de collatione sacramentorum" p. 23, et ex altera parte practice definiret: "Si autem carentia ovariorum certo non innotesceret, procul dubio favendum esset contrahentium libertati" p. 10, et in tali quovis dubio sequeretur ipse sententiam mitiorem. Quibus nefandis delictis, atrocibus malis, horrendis effectibus deterriti, nos iterum atque iterum clamabimus, clamante simul omni jure tum divino tum humano: Non solum desiderandum est, sed etiam omnibus viribus enitendum et efficiendum, ne unquam Summus Pontifex tale impedimentum constituat *de jure ecclesiastico;* contra potius, ut opinionem auctoris declaret esse saltem non tutam.

9.—Quoad citationem ex editione, quae dicitur, quarta "D'Annibaliana" desumptam,—heic textum citationis auctoris juxta textum verum collocabo.

Textus citationis auctoris ex editione 4ª desumptae, cum auctoris initio et commentario, p. 26.

a.—*Auctoris initium—et textus idem ille.* "De caetero quomodo potest ill. adversarius provocare ad D'Annibale, qui in *4ª ed. 1897, vol. 2;*[54] *n. 431, nota 9,* ita loquitur: Nubere non prohibetur mulier, quae 1° *sterilis* effecta est per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum (S. U. I., 3 Feb., 1887), quia sterilitas non idem est ac impotentia; vel 2° utero careat, *dummodo concipere possit.* Utrum vero concipere possit necne, medicorum judicio relinquimus."

b.—*Commentarius auctoris.* "Uti

Textus verus editionis 4ªᵉ ab haeredibus Card. D'Annibale demortui procuratae,—et editionis 3ªᵉ ab ipso Cardinale vivo adornatae.[53]

a.—*Editio 4ª A. D. 1896–1897 parata.* "Nubere non prohibetur mulier, quae 1° *sterilis* effecta est per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum (S. U. I., 3 Feb. 1887), quia sterilitas non idem est ac impotentia; vel 2° utero careat, *dummodo concipere possit* (V. Eschb., §§ 1, 8, V.). Utrum autem concipere possit necne, medicorum judicio relinquimus. Sed in hoc casu nemo audeat matrimonium contrahendum permittere vel impedire, aut jam contractum nullum decernere, inconsulta S. Sede."

[53] Summas heic ago gratias P.P. Jesuitis Collegii Woodstockiani, quorum benignitate copia mihi facta est legendi textum verum.

[54] Lege *vol. 3.*

apparet, Card. D'Annibale in primo casu supponit in muliere potentiam, seu possibilitatem physicam generandi (*sterilis* effecta) vel ob operationem non perfectam, vel ob ovaria supplementaria. Et certe si ovariorum excisio talis esset, ut mulier per illam fieret tantummodo sterilis, nubere non prohiberetur. In altero casu permittit matrimonium vel non, secundum quod mulier generare potest vel secus, de quo medicos judices declarat."

b.—*Editio 3ª A. D. 1892 (vol. 3), adornata.* "At nubere non prohibetur mulier cujus vaginae os obstructum est, vel quae utero caret; illa enim congredi potest, haec et concipere (Eschb. §§ 1, 8, V.): nec ea cui utrumque ovarium penitus exectum fuit (S. U. I. 3 Feb. 1887). Scilicet matrimonium ad mutuum quoque vitae adjutorium pertinet, et ad concupiscentiam coercendam."

Ad 9.—Cuilibet utrumque textum editionis 4ae attente legenti, apparent haec:

a.—Omisit sine ullis omissionis indiciis auctor verba illa circa medium textus veri uncis inclusa, videlicet: "(V. Eschb. §§ 1, 8, V)"—quae satis innuunt, *scriptorem horum editionis 4ae verborum* ipsa intellexisse *sensu Eschbachii, praecipui patroni sententiae auctori contrariae.*

b.—Omisit auctor finem textus scil. "Sed in hoc casu *nemo audeat matrimonium contrahendum permittere vel impedire, aut jam contractum nullum decernere, inconsulta S. Sede.*" Quorum loco auctor e contrario scribit: "Card. D'Annibale . . . in altero casu *permittit matrimonium vel non,* secundum quod mulier generare potest vel secus, de quo medicos judices declarat." Cur auctor haec sub (*a*) et (*b*) omiserit, et quomodo commentarius auctoris cum textu genuino omisso plane diverso conciliari possit, judicet lector.

c.—Praeterea notet, quaeso, lector quaedam facta scil. (1) Card. Joseph D'Annibale *mortuus* est Romae die 19. Juli, 1892;[55] et illam editionem 4am *Summulae "paullo emendatiorem,* votis plurium obsecundantes, *ediderunt Emi Auctoris haeredes"*[56] A. D. 1896—

[55] *Appleton's Annual Cyclopedia, 1892,* p. 584, col. 2.
[56] *Anal. Eccl.,* vol. 4, p. 503.

1897. (2) Jamvero conferat, oro, lector inter se textum hujus editonis 4ae cum textu editionis 3ae A. D. 1891—1892 ab ipso Emo Cardinale adornatae et reperiet, quomodo hunc potissimum locum "Emi Auctoris haeredes paullo emendatiorem" reddiderint—omittendo etiam Decretum S. Off. de die 30. Julii 1890 quod mense Februario 1894, uti videtur, primum publici juris factum, defunctus Card. D'Annibale, si vixisset editionis 4ae tempore, procul dubio heic attulisset! Et nihilominus auctor scribit interrogando: "Quomodo potest ill. adversarius provocare ad *D'Annibale* qui in *4a ed.* ita loquitur etc." Sane nequit merito provocari ad editionem 4am *ab haeredibus "paullo emendatiorem" quatuor vel quinque annis post mortem auctoris procuratam*, quasi quae veram mentem Card. D'Annibale exhibeat—cum *certo cognitae menti Card. D'Annibale* in *editione 3a ab ipso vivo* parata *clare expressae* plane contradicat in pluribus.

10.—"Adversarius accusat nos de mutilatione verborum in Decisionibus S. Officii referendis . . . praetermittendo haec verba: *Re mature diuque perpensa.* At haec verba nihil omnino adjungunt Decisionibus S. Congregationis, quae semper *diu matureque rem perpendit* . . . sunt formula communis," p. 26.

Ad 10.—a.—Heic afferendum duco Decisionis S. Off. diei 30. Julii 1890 textum originalem italicum, quem paucis abhinc diebus inveni apud *Analecta Ecclesiastica*,[57] unde, primum verisimiliter publici juris factum, deprompsisse videntur acta *Canoniste Contemporain*, mense Aprili 1894, quae etiam versionem latinam ejusdem exhibuerunt, teste *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*.[58]

"Mulier N.N. cui operatione chirurgica ablata fuerunt duo ovaria et uterus, a matrimonio arceri nequit."[59]

Illmo e Rmo Signore,

Nella Congregazione di feria IV 23 corrente fui discusso il dubbio proposto da Vostra Signoria con istanza del 31 ottobre dell'anno scorso. Se cioè una donna (N.N), cui per mano chirurgica siano state asportate ambedue le ovaie e l'utero possa ammetersi al matrimonio, e dopo maturo esame gli Emi Signori Card. Inquisitori generali miei colleghi hanno deciso—*Matrimonium non esse impeaiendum.*

[57] Vol. 2, p. 57, mense Februario, 1894

[58] Tom. 26, p. 287, 1894. Quam versionem atinam viae supra p. 318.

[59] Ita *Anal. Eccl.*

Nel significarle ciò per norma di cotesta Curia Le auguro dal Signore ogni bene.

Di Vostra Signoria. *Affmo nel Signore:*
R. *Card.* MONACO."

Roma, 30 luglio 1890.

Mons. Vescovo di Reggio Emilia

b.—Asserta auctoris refutantur factis. Verba ista: *re diu matureque perpensa* non sunt formula communis neque semper requiruntur, quia aliae res sunt satis faciles solutu peritis, aliae autem jam alio tempore antea fuerunt satis *diu matureque perpensae;* et tunc dubia tum de ejusmodi rebus, etiam summi momenti, tum de facilibus, porrecta *cito* solvi possunt ac revera solvuntur, omissis verbis: *re diu matureque perpensa*, quippe quod veritati haud conveniant. E. g. Archiepiscopus Cameracensis *de abortu medicali* dubium gravissimum proposuit S. Off.[60] et mox[61] Rmus Orator impetravit Decisionem, in qua nulla fit mentio verborum: *re diu matureque perpensa*, et simpliciter dicitur: *Negative*, juxta alia Decreta.

c.—Verba: *re diu matureque perpensa*, non sunt otiosa, sed ponderosa ac significant: Rem magni momenti–difficilemve una cum adjunctis fuisse *longo tempore*, *magna diligentia*, *plena deliberatione* consideratam ac pensatam[62] quae omnia, uti modo dixi, neque in rebus jamjam ita pensatis, neque in solutu facilibus exiguntur vel praestantur.

d.—Dico jam cum cl. Sili,[63] cujus voto in celeberrima causa *Monasterien.* ibidem apud *Anal. Eccl.* relata Emi. Cardinales maximam vim tribuerunt,—Responsum S. Off. de die 3. Febr. 1887 et Decretum ejusdem de die 30. Julii 1890 esse *meras et simplices declarationes* legis naturalis. "(1) Concedimus Cardinales Inquisitores per se, id est independenter a promulgatione facta de mandato et nomine Papae, non condere leges. Verum hic agitur non de lege condenda, sed de applicanda lege naturali; qua in re S. O. est competens, quin ulla opus sit promulgatione. Hujusmodi enim applicatio includit quidem legis interpretationem, sed comprehensivam tantum[64] (quia nempe naturae jus immutari

[60] REV., vol. 14. p. 171.
[61] Eschbach, *Disp. Theol. Physiol.*, p. 469.
[62] Cf. Lehmkuhl, supra p. 320.
[63] Apud *Anal. Eccl.*, vol. 8, p. 256.
[64] Seu potius *declarationem.*

non patitur), quam proinde necesse non est promulgare. . . . Et haec de valore juridico praedictarum decisionum: quoad vero valorem doctrinalem, esto S. O. per se non esse infallibile, nec accedente approbatione Papae, si materia decisionis aut forma approbationis excludat sententiam ex cathedra (*Lehmkuhl l. c. n. 202*), at quis neget ejus responsa summa pollere auctoritate? Quanti ea facienda sint nos recenter docuit S. H. C.[65], quae in *Parisien.* 28 Aug. 1898, cum ageretur de casu clandestinitatis haud difficili, sed apud eam novo, noluit sententiam edere antequam exploraretur S. O. archivium, si forte aliqua similis causa apud dictum supremum tribunal proposita fuisset; quod tamen inveniri non potuit. (2) Sacrae Congregationes respondent circumstantiis expressis in dubio, quod enunciatur in ipso decreto, non autem circumstantiis, quae maneant occultae; secus infinitis aequivocationibus daretur locus, et praeterea hoc inconveniens haberetur, quod S. C. unam quaestionem proponeret in dubio, et aliam substantialiter diversam dirimeret in decisione." Quibus a doctissimo viro Sili sapienter dictis haec addere lubet: Mea quidem sententia Decisiones illae S. Officii sunt merae ac simplices declarationes (1) *legis naturalis*—tum communi populi a natura edocti sensu[66] tum doctrina ac praxi Ecclesiae scholaeque universae, per multa saecula, hucusque ita intellectae ideoque *moraliter certae;* (2) pariterque *legis ecclesiasticae*—itidem communi interpretatione, doctrina, praxi Ecclesiae theologorumque omnium per saecula tradita *moraliter certae*,—uti supra satis monstratum fuisse videtur. "Quapropter" omnino "sunt ad rem ea, quae" citantur "ex *Il Monitore* Cardinalis Gennari, qui ibi loquitur de promulgatione *legum* ecclesiasticarum," neque "illa arbitrario duabus illis particularibus Decisionibus" applicantur: quocirca iterum exclamatur "emphatice: 'Ubi S. Officium non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus.'" E contrario cum S. Officium nullo modo confundat[67] *sterilitatem* seu impotentiam generandi cum *impotentia maritaliter coeundi*, suis auctori verbis, p. 27, respondetur: "Ubi S. Officium non confundit, nec nos confundere debemus."

[65] Scil. S. Congregatio Concilii.

[66] Sili l. c. p. 253, col. 1.

[67] Cf. Lehmkuhl, supra pp. 317 et 318; item 320 et 321.

e.—Etiamsi quis forte nihilominus tenere velit has Decisiones esse potius omnino particulares, tamen cum cl. Tanquerey,[68] qui etiam l. c. n. 1, allegat duo illa opuscula ab Antonelli conscripta, optimo jure docere potest: "Quamvis haec decreta vim legis generalis non habeant, *prudens confessarius ea in praxi sequetur, quum nemo naturali jure nubendi privari debeat, nisi constet eum aliquo impedimento ligari.*" Vide etiam quae in hanc partem cl. Lehmkuhl docte more suo disseruit.[69]

f.—Huc adjungantur quae auctor scribit nota pp. 22 et 23: "'Nonnulli theologi affirmant carentiam ovariorum esse impedimentum dirimens matrimonium; alii vero negant. In praxi igitur tuto sententiam negantem, uti probabilem sequi possumus.'

Qui ita ratiocinantur, quaestionis nostrae statum intelligere non videntur. Nam, relicta nunc doctrina de obligatione sequendi sententiam tutiorem, quotiescumque agitur de collatione sacramentorum; probabilitas adversae sententiae, ut in dissertatione innuimus, vi sententiae nostrae debet necessario ac omnino evanescere. Ut enim habetur apud *Comp. Theol. Moralis Gury-Ballerini-Palmieri ed. xiii Prati, 1898 pag. 55, not. 7,* 'probabilitas componi simul cum certitudine non potest, tum quia a certitudine longe distat, tum quia probabilitas, quae contra se habeat certitudinem, penitus evanescit.' Et ratio est, quia sententia adversariorum et nostra fundantur in duobus diversis ac ad invicem contradictoriis suppositis, scilicet ovaria *esse* et *non esse* necessaria ad actum conjugalem. Quando autem duae adversae sententiae fundantur in duobus ad invicem contradictoriis suppositis, si unum ex illis falsum esse invicte demonstratur, etiam sententia, quae illo falso supposito fulciebatur, est falsa; ac proinde nullo prorsus gaudet amplius probabilitatis gradu. Non recte igitur sententia nostra, ratione oppositae probabilitatis, oppugnatur."

Ita auctor. At bona cum venia ejus, minime gentium invicte demonstratum est vel ab illo vel ab alio quocumque falsum esse suppositum sententiae Eschbachii scil. "ovaria *non esse* necessaria ad actum conjugalem" seu ad copulam maritalem, qua copulam. Contra nobis videtur falsum auctoris suppositum, ovaria *esse* necessaria ad copulam qua talem, quia copula conjugalis ipsa, qua copula, semper perficitur ac peragitur sine ovulis et sine ovariis: non enim mulier *libere*, quando vult, potest effundere, neque reapse effundit *in vaginam* seu organum copulationis, ovula

[68] *Synopsis Theol. Mor., 1902, Suppl.* ad Tr. de Matr., n. 7. Opus admodum egregium.

[69] Supra p. 317 sq.

sua, uti vir potens tempore copulationis, in vaginam semen suum effundit, et saepissime *nulla ovula adsunt parata* in mulieribus etiam physiologice sanis; neque mulier viro copulatur ovariis, sed vagina. Quare cl. Laurentius, S.J.,[70] hisce diebus ipsis ita breviter et absolute scribit pro foro utroque: "Mulier vero est impotens, si ita arcta est, ut congressus sexualis fieri nequeat. Defectus in partibus interioribus muliebrium, ut defectus ovariorum per excisionem remotorum, in foro ecclesiástico non habetur causa impotentiam mulieris constituens."

Adde quod nulla prorsus est obligatio sequendi opinionem auctoris severiorem in re nostra. Heic enim agitur non praecise de collatione sacramentorum, sed de antecedente jure naturali matrimonium ineundi, de quo Bucceroni,[71] alter auctoris dux ac patronus, profert haec quoad dubia vel juris vel facti: "In . . . casu impotentiae licet matrimonium contrahere, quia gravissimum esset propter dubium matrimonio quempiam privare, et possidet certum jus ad ipsum, nisi impotentia probetur, vel certe favet ei praesumptio, quod sit naturaliter potens." Imo etiamsi concedatur heic agi de collatione sacramenti, tamen cum S. Alphonso[72] dicendum est: "Cum enim sit probabilissimum, licitum esse ministrare sacramentum sub conditione, si justa adsit causa, secundum dicta n. 28, hic satis justam causam habet nubendi sub conditione, si sit habilis, ne scilicet in tali dubio cogatur perpetuo manere caelebs.' Quod etiam auctor sensisse videtur, quando alibi, p. 10 nota, contra doctrinam suam supradictam ita scripsit: "Si autem carentia ovariorum certo non innotesceret, procul dubio favendum esset libertati contrahentium," ergo pro quovis dubio in casu, licet ageretur de collatione sacramenti. Quapropter aequali jure theologi illi, qui utramque sententiam probabilem reputantes versantur in dubio, juxta principia Bucceroni aliorumque omnium, recte affirmant: in praxi quemlibet tuto sequi posse sententiam Eschbachii.

11.—"Quod adseritur a cl. adversario de publicatione cl. Bucceroni, et de opinionibus nonnullorum Professorum Romanorum, videtur nobis exaggeratum et nimis probare. Nos quaerimus veritatem, et nihil aliud," p. 28.

[70] *Instit. Jur. Eccl.*, Friburgi Brisgoviae **1903**, n. 619.
[71] *Inst. Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 1031.
[72] *Theol. Mor.*, L. 6, n. 1102.

Ad 11.—Etiam "nos quaerimus veritatem, et nihil aliud." Quare loco citato[73] diximus: "Quod plures apprime egregii Professores Romani opinionem cl. Doctoris docent, eam minime reddit *veram.*" Ac revera, ut ibidem addidimus, plures celeberrimi Theologi Romani in rebus gravissimis vehementer errarunt. Nam ad theologos omnes tam Romanos quam alios pertinet notissimum illud: Tantum valet auctoritas, quantum valet ratio et pondus; ac proinde si ratio intrinseca sive auctoritas omnino praeponderans, contra opinionem theologorum etiam Romanorum occurrit, non potest haberi certa, imo ne probabilis quidem. Jamvero auctoritas S. Officii in nostram partem omnino inclinat, testibus theologis primi subsellii, etiam ipsis alterius opinionis sectatoribus, uti Lehmkuhl,[74] non obstantibus opusculis Antonellii "*invicte, palmarie, solidissime, sine effugio* contrarium probantibus,"—si verba Decisionum S. Officii *objective, uti jacent,* juxta propriam et naturalem eorum significationem vere ecclesiasticam ac theologicam hucusque traditam sumantur, et non tantum subjective juxta novam quandam quorumdam notionem physiologicam. Accedit, quod in ipsa re nostra alii theologi, etiam Romani, saltem aeque praeclari auctori ejusque asseclis intrinsecis summi momenti rationibus acriter contradicunt. Quod autem cl. Bucceroni allegationem de declaratione quadam privata Cardinalis S. Officii Secretarii voce data spectat, profecto cl. Eschbach ad publicas Decisiones ipsius S. Officii *uti jacent,* et ad *publicam* interpretationem ab Assessore S. Officii *publice* factam *potiori* jure provocat, quam ejus adversarii ad privatum responsum et "vivae vocis oraculum" alicujus Secretarii S. Officii. Denique etiam nos haud negamus Decisiones illas S. Officii jure posse dici *forma* particulares, sed *materia* tenemus eas esse omnino universales, qua distinctione solvitur etiam difficultas ab auctore p. 29, prolata. Quae omnia sane probant, quod probare volunt, scil. auctoritatem opinionemque Antonellii ejusque asseclarum neutiquam esse tanti faciendam, quanti facit auctor identidem iterando ac repetendo:[75] "Et *sufficiat* nomen afferre clariss. *Joseph Antonelli* . . . qui data opera duobus opusculis *invicte* ac *triumphaliter* sententiam nostram propugnat;" cl. *Bucceroni,*

[73] Supra p. 60.

[74] Supra p. 320. Cf. etiam cl. Tanquerey infra sub V. 3, et Laurentius l. c.

[75] Pleraeque litterae cursivae a me sunt procuratae.

qui *Antonellii* sententiam *amplexus* . . . ; cl. *De Luca* . . . qui *plausu* ac *laudibus Antonellium prosequitur* . . . ; clariss. *Lapponi* . . . ; clariss. *Topai* . . . qui duo postremi opusculis italice conscriptis rem *palmarie* tuentur." . . . "*veritate* victi," pp. 13, 14. "*Veritatis* oppugnatores . . . quod et in casu nostro," p. 16. "Argumenta cl. Eschbach, quae cl. Antonellius . . . *in nihilum* redegit. Unde clariss. De Luca . . . *justissime* judicavit: "Antonellius Rev.mum P. Eschbachium *palmarie* refutat," p. 21. Sed haec hactenus.

12.—"Impotentes sunt vir et femina ita senes, ut actum coniugalem perficere nullatenus possint," p. 9.

"Uti patet, thesis nostra casus respicit, in quibus ovariorum absentia constare potest sive ex doctoris, qui chirurgicam operationem perfecit, testatione; sive aliis criteriis, quae certe non desunt. Ubi enim absentia illa verificatur, menstrua cessant, ipsae mamillae retrahuntur ac recedunt; necnon alia eveniunt, quae vitam mulieris veluti virilitate afficiunt," p. 10 nota.

"Arbitraria est etiam accusatio de inconstantia ex hoc, quod atrophiam organorum essentialium docuerimus esse impotentiam; et tamen vetulis, atrophia etiam *absoluta* ovariorum ex senectute laborantibus, matrimonium permittere, *iuxta ipsum, debeamus*," p. 20.

"Nam vetula non semper ad actum conjugalem, quo ex se esset possibilis generatio, est inepta: cum aliquando, etsi vetula, sit apta; aliquando sit inepta per accidens; aliquando sit inepta per se; in quo ultimo casu certe ipsa est, pro re nostra, sicut femina carens ovariis," p. 31.

Ad 12—Si probe intelligam haec auctoris dicta, juxta ipsum vetula potest esse vere impotens ob absentiam ovariorum **ex sola senectutis desiccatione**, quando scilicet adsunt criteria ab eo descripta. Quod si auctor revera docet, certo obnititur universali et perpetuae doctrinae ac praxi "a primordiis servatae" tum Ecclesiae tum omnium omnino cujuscumque scholae theologorum talia vetularum matrimonia permittentium, etiam in casibus, ut bene ait Lehmkuhl,[76] in quibus vel praesumptio vel ipsa certitudo extinctae generandi facultatis adest. Hoc quoque auctoris dux Antonelli admittit scribendo:[77] "Hac certe ratione, Ecclesia numquam matrimonium senum prohibuit." Haec igitur doctrina auctoris si revera eam tenet videtur vere temeraria. Qua tamen supposita,

[76] Supra p. 316.

[77] *De Conceptu*, n. 103.

libenter revoco accusationem inconstantiae contra auctorem hac ex parte factam.

13.—"Quid potius respondet adversarius, si vir senex, quamvis erectionem patiatur et *materialem* copulam perficere queat, ob senectutem[78] tamen careat semine, quod ipse in definitione coitus posuit?" p. 21.

Ad 13.—a.—Quoad matrimonium *contrahendum:*

1. *Speculative,* cum Petro de Ledesma[79] dicendum est: "Si enim senes sunt ita senio confecti et exhausti, quod nullo modo seminare valeant, quamvis possint erigere membrum et penetrare vas, non possunt contrahere, et si contrahunt, matrimonium est invalidum." Aliter tamen prorsus judicandae sunt feminae vetulae, quae etiam utcumque senio confectae, exhaustae, absolute exsiccatae, semper valide contrahere possunt "modo possint ingressum viri pati ad claustra pudoris,"[80] ut modo diximus sub **12.**

2. *Practice,* quisnam hoc probabit modo licito in casu viri senis? Ergo Ecclesia viros senes cujuscumque aetatis ad matrimonium admittit, neque confessarius quidquam de potentia viri senis debet indagare, nisi ab ipso sene interrogetur.

b.—Quoad matrimonium *contractum:*

1. Cum Lehmkuhl[81]: "Licita etiam habetur copula, si vir sterilis est aut (*a*) propter senectutem, aut (*b*) propter impotentiam supervenientem; saltem si in utroque casu congressus perfici potest, etsi *veri* aut *fertilis* seminis emissio non habeatur . . . siquidem in actu ex se conjugibus licito non ipsi faciunt, quo impediatur generatio, sed hoc fit naturae defectu." Quamdiu igitur habetur vel *sola probabilis spes* copulam perficiendi, ipsa certo exerceri potest.

2. Quid singularitur de viris post matrimonium *contractum* castratis? Alii, ut D'Annibale,[82] tenent copulam ejusmodi esse *licitam,* alii, ut Eschbach,[83] tenent esse *illicitam.* Practice potest igitur dissimulari. Dicit quidem auctor, p. 23:

[78] Nonne haec auctoris suppositio contradicit doctrinae ducis ejus Antonelli scribentis: "Confectio zoospermatum in mare, semel incepta, *tota vita perdurat, etiam in tarda senectute.*" (*De Conc.*, n. 2).

[79] Apud Eschb., *Disp.*, p. 200.

[80] Salm., *De Matr.*, c. 12. n. 126.

[81] *Theol. Mor.*, vol. 2, n. 835, 4; ed. 10.

[82] *Summula,* vol. 3, n. 470, not. 13.

[83] *Disp.*, p. 200.

"Unde vel thesis nostra nullatenus est admittenda; vel simul cum ipsa omnes necessariae consequentiae, non dimidiatae, sed integrae admittendae sunt. Quapropter si carentia ovariorum, quae ante matrimonii celebrationem existit, matrimonium ipsum dirimit ac invalidum reddit; carentia ovariorum, quae post matrimonii celebrationem locum habet, impedit certissime usum Matrimonii. Carentiam ovariorum tanquam impedimentum dirimens agnoscere, ac conjugibus tali carentia affectis usum matrimonii permittere, est apertissima contradictio," *cf.* p. 24.

At multis theologis gravibus vel ipsa castratio virorum **post nuptias** facta, quae certissime est impedimentum dirimens matrimonii ineundi, non videtur obstare legitimo usui matrimonii. Nec sine ratione. Nam jus per matrimonium validum ad ejus usum acquisitum revera est omnino certum et certo est in possessione, quousque aliquo modo copula perfici unusque saltem finis, etiam secundarius, obtineri potest. Jure igitur suo utuntur conjuges copulam illam exercendo; semen autem *non emitti* contingit per accidens, sicut accidit semen esse sterile. Ita fere illi theologi.

V.—Tractatio cl. Lehmkuhlii—et cl. Editoris A. E. R.

1.—*Cl. Lehmkuhl.*—Mea quidem opinione auctor pp. 30 sq. cl. Patrem Lehmkuhl indigne tractavit, quinimo vel ipsi auctoris fautores se ejusdem esse opinionis mihi aperte fassi sunt. Sed non sum is, qui viri eximii patrocinium suscipere debeam. Ipse enim plus quam satis sese tueri poterit. Quod tamen viro illi doctissimo ac celeberrimo haudquaquam profecto opus est, quum aureo praeclarae inter omnes famae maximaeque auctoritatis clypeo, operibus et scriptis summa laude dignis comparato,—placide ejusmodi tela inania excipiat, confringat, repercutiat. Haec tantum dicenda esse arbitror.

a.—Cl. Lehmkuhl agens de difficultate *theoretica*, conatur tantummodo, sine ira et partium studio, statum quaestionis *cum utriusque partis argumentis* summatim exponere. Cur igitur tantae irae adversus virum illum sane modestum, quod simpliciter noluerit suam opinionem aliis per fas et nefas obtrudere asserendo v. c., "Quae omnia *solidissime* ac *sine effugio* tractata ac confutata fuerunt a cl. Antonelli . . . et a cl. Bucceroni . . . sicut tractata ac confutata fuerunt in nostro articulo pro mense Februario qui ad auctorem non pervenerat, quando talia scripsit," p. 31.

Pervenerant ad eum profecto opuscula illa "invicte, solidissime, sine effugio, palmarie" probantia; docuerat ipse *ante* cl. Antonelli, *ante* Bucceroni, *ante* auctorem nostrum aliosque, quantum scio, ipsam eorumdem opinionem: et nihilominus de ea modeste loquitur, ac probabilitatem saltem sententiae cl. Eschbachii admittit.

b.—Nullo jure dicit auctor de cl. viro sequentia, juxta quae ponuntur verba genuina.[84]

Narratio auctoris, p. 31.	Verba genuina Lehmkuhlii.
"Copulam **natura sua non generativam, seu non conjugalem,** matrimonium validum reddere, ex eo quod copula sufficit, ut sit perfecta **tantum** ex parte viri (sic!)."	"Et si semel admittitur, vim generandi ad valorem matrimonii in femina non esse necessariam, facile est gressum facere ad casum de carentia uteri: videlicet neque hunc defectum, quum non impediat copulam perfectam ex parte viri neque satisfactionem mulieris, esse impedimentum matrimonii dirimens."

Quibus collatis, liquent haec: (1) Auctor suo marte addidit verba: **natura sua non generativam seu non conjugalem,** item praesertim verbulum: **tantum,** sicque profecto sensum funditus mutavit. (2) Lehmkuhl heic loquitur hypothetice: "*Si* semel admittitur,"—conando sententiam, de qua agit, objective exponere; ac paullo ante[85] jam dixerat: "Quapropter matrimonium consistere posse validum, si modo **copula complete** haberi possit, quae **apta sit ad completam satisfactionem utrique** praestandam. (3) Quid enim est copula? Copula est *conjunctio conjugalis seu maritalis utriusque sexus*, i. e. viri ac feminae; secus nequit esse *copula;* et copula est *perfecta* ex parte viri, si *penetratio* simul et *inseminatio intra vas debitum* seu *vaginam normalem* feminae adest. Ergo *copula perfecta ex parte viri* **natura sua necessario** requirit conjunctionem carnalem cum femina, erectionem, vaginae penetrationem, intra vaginam inseminationem;—atque jam eo ipso est ac necessario esse debet, *qua copula*, substantialiter perfecta ex parte mulieris, quacum in muliere *regulariter* habetur quoque satisfactio completa,

[84] Supra p. 317. [85] Supra p. 316.

quae est *accidentale* complementum copulae substantialiter in muliere perfectae. Hoc loco Lehmkuhl videtur ex industria ita descripsisse copulam perfectam juxta sententiam, quam ibi exponere nititur, ne ullum ambigendi cavillandique locum relinqueret. Secundum constantem autem S. Thomae doctrinam[86] mas est principium activum, mulier vero principium *passivum;* ac proinde quoad copulam *recipere tantum* debet semen virile intra vaginam normalem penetratione viri naturali depositum, et reliqua in ea operatur natura.

c.—Caetera asserta auctoris superius satis agitata sunt. Quaedam tantum adnotanda videntur. (1) Auctor scribit, p. 33: "Jamvero haec excisio a chirurgo fieri potest vel laparotomia seu methodo vaginali, vel methodo sacrali, vel perineali." Ut particula: *seu* heic ab ipso ponitur contraria alteri particulae: *vel* ter repetitae, videtur auctor *laparotomiam* pro *eadem* vel *fere eadem* re habere ac *methodum vaginalem.* Quod utique est aliquid novum. Certo haud accurate retulit verba magistri Antonelli scribentis:[87] "In neutro casu S. O. proposito, indicatur qualis operatio adhibita fuerit, an scilicet laparatomia vel methodus vaginalis, vel methodus sacralis, vel perinealis."

2. Quod ad interpretationem Decisionum illarum S. Officii pertinet, non secus ac Lehmkuhl Tanquerey quoque[88] scribit, etsi ambo opuscula Antonellii "invicte, triumphaliter, palmarie, sine effugio" contrarium probantia perlegerit: "Quam posteriorem sententiam[89] secutum est *S. Officium* in duobus casibus particularibus." Et tum in fine addit verba jam supra commemorata: "Prudens confessarius ea in praxi sequetur." Namque hi auctores sumunt verba Decisionum juxta propriam et naturalem eorum significationem ecclesiasticam ac theologicam hucusque traditam, et non juxta novam illam quorumdam physiologicam. Praeterea haec eorum agendi ratio, quamquam uterque "certissime modum in SS. Congregationibus procedendi callet" (p. 34), clare ostendit non posse jure affirmari: "Tamen de carentia totali ovariorum vel uteri non constabat . . . Et quod res ita se habeat, nunc

[86] E. gr. *Sent.* 4, Dist. 34, q. 1, a. 2 ad 6.

[87] *De Concepiu*, n. 129.

[88] *Synopsis Theol. Mor. Suppl.*, n. 7 B, ubi n. 1, citat opusc. Anton.

[89] Scil. Eschbachii, ib. n. 6.

certissimum est post ea, quae, duobus abhinc annis, publici juris facta fuerunt a cl. P. Bucceroni" (p. 13).—"Antonelli . . . **invicte ac triumphaliter** sententiam nostram propugnat" (p. 14). Cl. Lehmkuhl "scit quae dicimus esse **clarissima et citra controversiam**" (p. 34), et id genus alia.

2. *Cl. Editor* A. E. R.[90]—De quo auctor, p. 3, nota, ita scribit:

"Quod accidisse videtur editori cujusdam periodici, cui titulus AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, in quo hanc disputationem inceperamus. Ille enim, lingua vernacula usus, praepostere ac prorsus injuria, discussionem tanti momenti in medio ex abrupto jugulavit, antequam debita hinc inde responsa adducerentur: ac judicem se hujus perdifficilis quaestionis constituens, loco servandi altum silentium, levia de ipsa ac omnino erronea produxit, quae partium studium manifeste redolent.

Et revera: (a) In editione periodici pro mense Decembri 1902, pag. 656, editor ille scripsit *decretum* adesse S. Officii, cujus etiam verba refert, scilicet: '*Impotentes non sunt feminae, quae utroque ovario et utero carent.*' Quando haec verba legimus, magno affecti fuimus stupore: in eadem enim ipsissima editione illius periodici primus articulus noster continebatur, quo probamus decretum illud esse purum figmentum. Et sic editor ille decretum citavit quod non existit!

(b) In editione periodici pro mense Martio 1903, pag. 352, editor ille scripsit S. Officium decisiones emanasse pro casibus *absentiam* ovariorum respicientibus; dum in eodem periodico, duobus datis articulis, invicte probaveramus illas decisiones non respexisse *absentiam* ovariorum.

(c) Eodem in loco scripsit nos conatos *tantummodo* esse demonstrare nullam normam erui posse generalem ex S. Officii decisionibus; adversarium nostrum vero post decisionum analysim *demonstrasse* contrarium. Quam assertionem editor ille non protulisset, si argumenta perpendisset ac intellexisset, iisque solum ductus locutus fuisset; uti lectoribus ex hoc opusculo apparebit."

a.—Cl. Editor usus est lingua vernacula saltem in expositione principiorum, quia optime scivit, multos esse foliorum suorum lectores, qui mallent haec anglice exarari.

b.—Cl. Editor haud "praepostere ac prorsus injuria discussionem tanti momenti" jugulavit; nam noluit cl. vir vere miserandus lectoribus praebere pro subscriptione annua nihil nisi controversias, refutationes, responsiones sempiternas Casacca-nas Hild-ianasque, merito timens, ne, anno exeunte, ipse cum fisco suo jugularetur. Quare judicem se constituit non praecise hujus

[90] Quem enixe rogo, ne deleat, quae de eo scribenda hic argumenti causa putavi.

quaestionis, sed boni communis foliorum suorum ac lectorum, quorum sunt sexcenti alii praeter nos duos.

c.—Cl. Editor est ab omni partium studio alienissimus. Audiantur ejus verba ex epistolis ad me privatim datis deprompta. Die 8 Aprilis h. a. mihi scripsit: "A rejoinder would put the REVIEW in the position of partiality, for, after having refused (as it would seem) the article by Father Casacca because there was enough of the discussion, the editor would appear willing to take it up again when it comes from Father Casacca's opponent." Iterum die 18 Aprilis h. a. hanc de cl. D. Casacca laudem protulit: "Indeed, I hold him to be a learned and able man, and perfectly sincere in his argument."

d.—Cl. Editor scripsit adesse *decretum* S. Officii, quia versio Latina, quae ubique circumferebatur, Decisionis de die 30 Julii 1890 continebat vocabulum: *decreverunt.* Quod tamen auctor in alleganda ista Decisione omisit, et etiam postquam haec omissio ei objecta fuit,[91] hanc objectionem caute silentio praeteriit, p. 26. Nunc vero legimus in textu originali italico: "hanno deciso." Neque cl. Editor *solus* est, qui censet nondum esse a quoquam invicte probatum, decretum illud esse figmentum vel Decisiones illas non respexisse *absentiam* ovariorum: multi quoque alii idem omnino existimant.

e.—Quando cl. Editor scripsit, auctorem "conatum esse" (D. Casacca legit quod Editor non scripsit: "*tantummodo*") demonstrare nullam normam erui posse generalem ex S. Officii Decisionibus, multo ante praeoccupavit auctorem,qui nunc ipse plane idem fatetur p. 3: "Perbrevi hoc libello duo moliri **conati sumus.**" Atvero, uti certus missionarius celeberrimus juniori cuidam eum diutius concionando imitari profitenti quondam reposuit: "Quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi."

f.—Cl. Editor revera non dixit, auctoris adversarium "*demonstrasse*" contrarium, sed usurpavit vocabulum anglicum: "*show,*" quod heic significat tantum: simpliciter, practice ostendere, exponere, probare, non autem stricte et absolute demonstrare.

VI.—APPENDICULA: QUAESTIO GRAVISSIMA.

Quaeritur.—Teneturne mulier nupturiens exsectionem ovariorum manifestare sponso *ante* matrimonium?

[91] Supra p. 56.

Resp.—Tenetur, et quidem *ex justitia*, secundum S. Alphonsum, si velit nubere. Ratio est quia est defectus *damnosus* sponso, saltem ubi sponsus prolem gignere cupit, et "sicut peccat contra justitiam qui merces noxias vendit alteri credenti bonas, ita a fortiori qui cum pernicioso defectu vult matrimonium contrahere."[92] Quodsi sponsus nolit ducere mulierem excisionem ovariorum passam, juste potest hoc tamquam *conditionem sine qua non* in pactum deducere, uti ajunt, et ex justitia exigere, ut defectus ille manifestetur sub poena nullitatis contractus matrimonialis ineundi; quia non vult ducere talem mulierem ac proinde consensus ejus exterius tali mulieri datus esset nullus. Ut vero postea *hanc conditionem sine qua non* consensus sui juridice possit probare, debet eam aut documento rite confecto aut aliter coram testibus, saltem duobus, exigere.

VII.—Ultimum Vale.

Quibus omnibus mature perpensis, haud immerito affirmari posse videtur: cl. auctorem punctum non retulisse (p. 4). Contra optimo jure cum cl. Lehmkuhl,[93] Tanquerey, Laurentio, aliis docetur: Decisiones S. Officii in re nostra, quamquam *particulares* reputantur, saltem abunde *sufficiunt*, "ut inde securam sumere possimus normam practicam." Imo, sepositis etiam, argumentandi gratia, S. Officii Decisionibus, quum quaestio nostra saltem "theoretice nondum sit plane soluta,"[94] vel "disputata,"[95] secundum ipsius Bucceroni principia supra sub IV. 10. f. laudata, "licet matrimonium contrahere, quia gravissimum esset propter dubium matrimonio quempiam privare, et possidet certum jus ad ipsum, nisi impotentia probetur;" et secundum S. Alphonsum ibid. femina, de qua heic agitur, saltem "satis justam causam habet nubendi sub conditione, si sim habilis, ne scilicet in tali dubio cogatur perpetuo manere coelebs."

Et nunc ultimum vale dicam omnibus, ac promissis initio datis staturus, quidquid forte cl. auctor in contrarium disputaverit, in posterum silebo.

Joseph C. Hild, C.SS.R.

Ilchester, in Md.

[92] Aertnys, *Theol. Mor.*, L. 6, n. 442, qu. 2 ex S. Alph. [93] Supra p. 320.
[94] Lehmkuhl, supra p. 317. [95] Tanquerey, l. c. n. 6.

Analecta.

E S. CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

PROBATUR NOVA EDITIO MARTYROLOGII ROMANI.

Praesens Martyrologium novissime recognitum et auctum, Sacra Rituum Congregatio probante Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII, imprimi decrevit per Typographiam Polyglottam Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide: statuitque ab aliis ubique locorum deinceps typis edi non posse nisi accedente auctoritate Ordinarii loci et omnino ad normam huius exemplaris.

Die 1 Maii 1902.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

L. ✝ S. D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE PROPAGANDAE FIDEI.

EXPLICATUR DECRETUM 1 MARTII 1902 CIRCA PROHIBITIONEM CELEBRANDI MISSAM IN PRIVATIS CELLIS SUPER NAVIBUS.

Ill.me ac Rev.me Domine:

Quod per Decretum S. huius Congregationis diei 1 martii vertentis anni, est cautum super celebratione missae in navibus,

tantum respicit abusus illos qui orirentur, si in privatis cellulis viatorum, usibus vitae destinatis, indecenter offerretur augustissimum Sacrificium Missae. Non autem absolute celebratio in cellis prohibita est, quando adiuncta omnia removeant irreverentiae pericula. Quamobrem firmis manentibus Decreti praedicti praescriptionibus, velit Amplitudo Tua idem sincero sensu intelligere ac missionarios sine causa turbatos quietos facere.

Ego vero Deum rogo ut Te diu servet ac sospitet.

Amplitudinis Tuae addictissimus servus.

Roma 13 Agosto 1902.

ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secret.*

E S. CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

PIA EXERCITIA IN HONOREM SS. CORDIS JESU.

Decretum Urbis et Orbis, 30 Maii 1902.

Quo cultus erga Sacratissimum Cor Jesu per Catholicam Ecclesiam tam late diffusus adhuc majora incrementa susciperat f.r. Pius IX. per decretum S. Congr. Indulgentiarum d.d. 8 Maii 1873, nec non SS.mus D.nus Nr. Leo PP. XIII. per literas E.mi S. Rituum Congregationis Praefecti sub die 21 Julii 1899 ad Universos Episcopos transmissas, eum morem in pluribus Ecclesiis jam obtinentem, ut per integrum mensem Junium varia pietatis obsequia divino Cordi praestarentur quam maxime commendarunt, eique indulgentias adnexuerunt.

Quoniam vero de eisdem Indulgentiis ab utroque Pontifice concessis, pro memoratis piis exercitiis mense Junio peragendis aliquod dubium obortum fuerit, ad illud removendum, immo ut Fideles amplioribus etiam collatis gratiis spiritualibus ad cultum ejusdem SS. Cordis validius excitentur, Sacra Congregatio Indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SS.mo D.no N.ro specialiter tributis ea decernit quae sequuntur. *Omnes Christifideles, qui sive publice, sive privatim peculiaribus precibus devotique animi obsequiis in honorem SS. Cordi Jesu mense Junio corde saltem contrito vacaverint, Indulgentiam septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum semel singulis dicti mensis diebus lucrentur.*

Qui vero Christifideles privatim tantum singulis dicti mensis diebus praefata obsequia praestiterint simulque uno die vel intra memoratum mensem vel ex octo prioribus mensis Julii vere poenitentes, confessi ac S. Synaxi refecti, aliquam Ecclesiam vel publicum Oratorium visitaverint, ibique ad mentem Summi Pontificis pias preces effuderint Plenariam Indulgentiam consequentur.

Quam quidem plenariam Indulgentiam etiam ii Fideles lucrentur, qui saltem decem in mense vicibus ejusmodi exercitiis publice peractis interfuerint itemque supra memorata pia opera adimpleverint. Quas omnes Indulgentias eadem S. Congregatio etiam animabus igne purgatorio detentis fore applicabiles declarat.

Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Sec.ria ejusdem Cong.nis die 30 Maii 1902.

S. *Card.* Cretoni, *Praefectus.*
F. Sogaro, *Archiep. Amiden.*, *Secret.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—S. Congregation of Rites approves new edition of the Roman Martyrology.

II.—S. Congregation of the Propaganda interprets a former decree (March 1, 1902) regarding celebration of Mass aboard ship.

III.—S. Congregation of Indulgences: Indulgences for devotional exercises in honor of the Sacred Heart during the month of June.

INDULT REGARDING THE SABBATINE PRIVILEGE.

The Vice Procurator General of the Fathers of the Mission (Lazarists) has obtained from the Holy See for the priests of his Order the faculty of commuting the obligations attached to the Sabbatine Privilege. The faculty may be used in favor of the Sisters of Charity and of all persons who dwell in establishments under their care or direction. As is well known, the Indulgences comprised in the Sabbatine Privilege, applying to those who wear the brown scapular (Mt. Carmel), entails ordinarily the obligation of reciting the "Little Office of the Bl. V. M." Those who cannot read must abstain from meat on Wednesdays and Saturdays, and observe the regular fastdays prescribed by the Church. The faculty of commuting these obligations is ordinarily restricted to the Carmelites, especially in places where there is a Convent of the Order. The Text of the Concession in the original is as follows:

E Sacra Congregatione Indulgentiarum.

Beatissime Pater:

Agostino Veneziani, Pro-Procuratore Generale della Missione, prostrato al bacio del S. Piede, supplica umilmente la S. V. a voler accordare ai Preti della Missione la facoltà di poter commutare alle

Figlie della Carità ed alle persone dimoranti negli stabilimenti diretti da dette Suore, il piccolo Ufficio della B. V., i digiuni e le astinenze che si richiedono per conseguire il privilegio *sabbatino*, dagli ascritti allo scapolare del Carmine, anche nei luoghi dove esistono Conventi o Case dell'Ordine Carmelitano, essendo molto difficile alle persone suddette recarsi per tal commutazione dai Padri Carmelitani. Che ecc.

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SS. D.N. Leone PP. XIII sibi specialiter tributis, benigne annuit pro gratia iuxta preces. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

L. † S. FRANCISCUS SOGARO, *Archiep. Amiden.*, *Secr.ius.*

THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW :

When we were boys I think the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" were better known among Catholics than they are to-day. The Christian Brothers used to train us to collect pennies for the book every week, and the Jesuits did likewise for the "Holy Childhood." Now we have pamphlets and annals from so many domestic as well as foreign sources that the "Propagation of the Faith" is lost sight of. Besides those "Annals" there are others issued by particular organizations, and I make bold to say that your readers will be interested and benefited by the synopsis of a letter in the "Annals of the Congregation of the Missson," from that land now so full of tragic interest, the land of Marco Bozzaris and of Alexander, son of Philip of Macedonia. Father Cazot, C.M., writes substantially as follows, under date of June 22, 1902 :

" . . . We take into our *seminary*, which is near Thessalonica, children eight or ten years old, for if they pass through other schools and come to us at fourteen or fifteen, they are possessed by schismatical ideas which it is almost impossible to eradicate. Even these little ones have had no Christian training either from their ignorant mothers or from the *popes ;* their parents have worldly views in sending them to us, and when the boys are seventeen or eighteen and think they know enough, off they go. One cause of this is the fact that *the students go home in vacation*, and it takes three

months to bring them back to their former condition, when they return to school. We cannot afford to keep them in the seminary during the vacation, but we must try and do so, else we will lose the fruit of our labor . . . Another obstacle to vocations is the low esteem in which priests are held in schismatical countries, and the political agitation which takes in all ages in these Turk-ridden regions . . . We give special attention to our Catholic *popes*, the greater number of whom have been retained from schism, but are destitute, ignorant, and unfit for duty. This year we gave them a retreat, boarding them not only, but paying cost of their coming and going. It is a heavy charge for us, but it is necessary, and they make the retreat in a most edifying manner . . . They need our aid constantly, for their salary is exceedingly small (I suppose it comes from the Propaganda). We procure them 'intentions,' and of these we must have *eight to ten thousand a year*. We must get bread for them *and their families*, and the second-hand cassocks and cloaks we give them 'make them very happy and render them a little more presentable.' . . . We wish to organize monthly conferences for the *popes*, where they might receive *an instruction in the Catechism* and a spiritual conference, besides a fraternal agape, but we had scarcely commenced when the labor of the silk-worm interrupted it—'*every other interest must yield to the silk-worm.*' But we must resume this work in October in order to keep 'our popes' in the right way and to furnish them with instruction. Unfortunately our resources are absolutely insufficient, our schoolmasters, for example, receiving only forty dollars a year . . . We have a Vicar Apostolic; eight Lazarist priests and six brothers; an ecclesiastical and preparatory seminary, two residences and an orphanage for boys; four young native priests, celibates; twenty-four popes, seven Sisters of Charity with a house, a school, an orphanage and a dispensary; twelve or fifteen Eucharistic Sisters with an orphanage, three residences and three schools; ten schools for boys with fourteen 'professors'; three schools for girls with three mistresses; one thousand to fifteen hundred Bulgarian Catholic families . . . As a result of our labors, from eight to ten thousand Christians of the Oriental rite have entered the fold of the Holy Catholic Church, and few missions have so consoling a record. We could not succeed but for the protection of France! . . . " So far this missionary.

I would like to quote from another letter describing the consecration by Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Massaja of the Servant of God,

Justin de Jacobis, in far Abyssinia. "In the largest room of the house an altar was formed of three chests, two boxes made a side altar and two other boxes, covered with some red stuff, made the two shrines. These preparations lasted till midnight. The ceremony took place at 3 A.M., two Abyssinian priests, who knew Latin, acting as assistants. Two French travellers looked in from the one window on the water's edge, and at the door on the town-side of the building; Brother Paschall, a Capuchin, with a brace of pistols attached to his cord of St. Francis, watched out for any attack from Mussulmans. He kept an eye on the altar, however, and heard Mass and received Holy Communion. The new Bishop received a silver ring with a piece of colored glass in it; one pectoral cross served the two Bishops, the one who was consecrated acting as Master of Ceremonies! When all was over, the 'altar' was stripped, the future Cardinal leaped from the window into the boat that was to carry him further on his way, and the new Bishop remained alone in his boundless diocese in Abyssinia."

I have had the thought for some time back that a selection from the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" or from those of the Congregation of the Mission, the "Lettres edifiantes" of the Jesuits, etc., in our weeklies would be very interesting, edifying and useful. I do not offer the above summary as one that would be exactly eligible for their columns, but I confess that I thought it would suit those of the REVIEW, and I submit it with my thought to my brethren of the clergy.

EDWARD MCSWEENEY.

Mount St. Mary's, April 21.

THE "CARENTIA OVARIORUM" ONCE MORE.

In the present issue of the REVIEW, the Redemptorist Professor Hild gives a thorough critique of Dr. Casacca's pamphlet. The passages which he analyzes in order to lay bare the sophisms of a seemingly plausible argument are given in full, so that the reader who is interested may not at every step be obliged to refer to the original. This is our apology for the length of the paper which, we trust, will satisfy every student of the subject.

It may be asked how, if it be granted that Father Casacca's argument has, theoretically, some foundation, it should yet be practically untenable; the answer is that theory builds upon specu-

lative conditions which of course may be true, whilst legislation builds upon actual conditions which may prevent the realization of an ideal project no matter how true. Thus, it is true that a man who is known to be guilty of fraud deserves imprisonment or fine. Yet the law does not allow the individual to cause the imprisonment of another on the mere knowledge that he has committed a fraud. There must be proof; otherwise, any number of persons might be imprisoned on the statement of prejudiced or suspicious parties. In the case of the *carentia ovariorum* we may have the condition of a person born without the *ovarium*, or the organ may be removed; in the latter case it has been admitted that it is always difficult, if not impossible, for a surgeon to state that an operation has removed the entire *ovarium*. A marriage could, therefore, not be prevented on the plea of foreseen sterility (or what Father Casacca calls impotence). The marriage being allowed, let us assume that it proves sterile, and that after a year or two the husband pleads for separation. We should ask: On what ground? Sterility as the result of the *carentia?* Why, sterility might be the result of any number of other causes. To say that there are more or less definite indications of the true cause in a case of absolute absence of the organ furnishes reason for regarding the *carentia* as an impedient impediment, not in the technical sense used in our text-books, but in the sense in which Fr. Lehmkuhl and most theologians regard it when they exact the manifestation of the defect to the intended husband, so as to avoid what is in many eyes an *error substantialis* in a serious contract. But the annulling of the marriage is a matter that demands more than suppositions resting on mere abstract theory. Nor can we see any advantage in setting confessors by the ear through the endeavor to extend the stringent application of laws beyond their present recognized scope. We have laws enough. Let us see to the conscientious observance of these in place of looking for arguments to add to them.

WHAT OUR RELIGIOUS ORDERS DO FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

Mr. E. B. Sargent, Director of Education in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, gives to the London *Times* the result

of his observations regarding the conditions of education at home and abroad. His plea is for higher education, and his inquiry has led him to look for the means by which it is best supplied. He found by experience that where the State failed to supply high schools of a desirable type, it was generally through the local Church organizations that attempts were made to fill the need. This had also been done in the colonies in whose educational progress he was interested. As a matter of fact results had proved that none of the religious bodies were successful in accomplishing what they had desired. The causes he held to be manifold—insufficient revenues, sectarian jealousies, lack of tradition, and steady control. But he found it quite otherwise in the case of the Catholic Religious Teaching Communities. These he had seen develop and flourish in a way which had commanded his closer attention to the quality of the educational work they professed to do. On examination he found the teaching in the higher branches by the Religious so admirable that he does not hesitate to appeal to the authorities in England to abandon all sense of discrimination and bigotry and to give a fair opportunity to those who are by all odds doing most and best work for education in the colonies where they have an open field for their development.

"In contrast with the provincial efforts of other Church organizations," writes Dr. Sargent, "stood the wonderful success of the Church of Rome in providing throughout our colonies and for all classes of the population—Protestant as well as Catholic—educational facilities of every description."

"This work was not, as a rule, accomplished through the instrumentality of her local ecclesiastical organizations, but by means of colonizing settlements of men and women belonging to one or other of the Religious Orders of the Church, or technically by the 'regulars,' and not by the 'seculars.' Each settlement established, maintained, and controlled one or more educational institutions, and showed in its work all possible marks of vitality, including the facilities of self-preservation, adaptability to environment, and reproductive growth. It was during a visit to Rhodesia, nearly five years ago, that I first had the opportunity of observing at what an early date in the British occupation of a country the Religious Orders can establish flourishing schools. Had the first white settlers been consulted, they would have,

no doubt, expressed their preference for an agency with which they were more familiar, but when they found that the education offered by the Regulars to their children was superior to that which under such conditions they could reasonably have expected, and when no attempt was made to introduce doctrinal teaching or to proselytize, their gratitude was sincere, and found expression in pecuniary assistance to the enlargement of the schools. In the various Australian colonies through which I afterwards travelled it became evident to me that though, as the population increased, Government took up the chief burden of the provision of schools, and though other Churches sometimes succeeded in the establishment of successful non-Government institutions, the Catholic schools still held their own, not only by reason of priority of foundation, but also in consequence of the guarantee which the stability of the Religious communities controlling them offered for the permanence of standard of the instruction supplied. It was not, however, until I had begun to investigate the conditions of education in Canada that I became fully aware of the powers of adaptation of these communities to local surroundings or of the fecundity which they exhibit. One instance must suffice. It is of a Religious Order which in France devotes itself to other "good works" as well as to education. A community professing this rule settled near New York and adapted itself to the local demand for school instruction. In the course of time it became the mother of numerous religious houses devoted to education, which spread through the States of the Union. One stray daughter began life in Nova Scotia, and before long descendants of the third generation in the New World were founding schools throughout the far western provinces of Canada. The number of religious of this order alone employed in teaching at the time of my visit was about 2,500 in the United States and about 250 in Canada. This vigor of school colonization on the part of the Regulars extends over secondary as well as primary education. Boarding schools for boys as well as girls, often planned to accommodate twice as many scholars as are received during the first few years, testify to the manner in which Rome builds for the future."

This is honest language from an English official who stands at the very head of the educational department in the African colonies. He does not merely give the conscientious testimony derived from personal experience, but in giving as the reason of the superiority of the Catholic schools the fact that our religious

teaching bodies form a permanently organized and well disciplined educational force, he bears unconscious witness to the Catholic system of Religious Teaching Orders everywhere.

THE BLESSING OF THE MEDAL OF ST. BENEDICT.

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Under date of March 12, 1903, the following official communication was sent to the undersigned in regard to the Blessing of the Medal of St. Benedict:

1. Only the Presidents of the Congregations and not the Abbots of the individual monasteries have the right of delegation. In the United States the Presidents of the "Congregatio Americano-Cassinensis," p. t. Rt. Rev. Abbot Peter, St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minn., and of the "Congregatio Americano-Helvetica," p. t. Rt. Rev. Abbot Frowin, Conception, Mo.

2. Faculties previously granted are not annulled. (Hence the Abbots of St. Vincent's and St. Meinrad's retain the power to give the faculty of blessing the ordinary Medal of St. Benedict.)

3. The power to subdelegate a priest for the blessing of the ordinary Medal of St. Benedict can be granted only by the Abbot Primate and the Abbot of the Monastery of Monte Cassino. The Abbot of Monte Cassino has the sole right of subdelegation in regard to the Jubilee Medal.

4. Special formulas for delegation are not needed.

5. The power of delegation is given to the Presidents of Congregations as such, and ceases with the time when they discontinue to act as presidents.

BEDE MALER, O.S.B.

St. Meinrad, Ind.

WHERE SHALL WE SPEND OUR VACATION?

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

The most enjoyable vacation that I have had was spent at a priest's house some hundreds of miles from here. The pastor wanted to go away for a short time; I heard of it and was delighted to take his place. Priests who teach in colleges and seminaries are usually fortunate enough to be invited by some of their former pupils to spend

their Summer vacations together. There are hundreds of pastors, especially in the smaller dioceses, who would like to occasionally have a few weeks' vacation, but their bishops have no priests to send in their places, and they themselves know of no priests whom they could ask; there are hundreds of assistants in the big cities who would be delighted to spend two or three weeks at some country rectory in some distant place, but we have no ecclesiastical intelligence offices through which these two classes may become acquainted. Many a priest who spends two or three weeks at an expensive hotel feels lost, and wishes that his vacation were over, and one who passes his time on railway trains is little better off; both would feel much more at home in a country rectory. A change of place and work is recreation; but life at a big hotel or on a train is the least desirable sort of recreation.

It will be a pleasure for me to put in communication any country pastors who may wish to go away for a few weeks, and any assistants who would like to take their places, if they will write to me, and will enclose two stamped envelopes addressed to themselves. The fact that I may make the vacations of some of my fellow-priests more enjoyable will amply repay me for what little trouble it may be to exchange the letters that I may receive.

J. F. SHEAHAN.

Pocantico Hills, N. Y.

WHAT MASS IS TO BE SAID AFTER THE DEDICATION OF A CHURCH?

To the Editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

The ceremony of dedication or blessing of a new church is by no means a rare occurrence in our days and is one of the proofs that the Catholic Church is continually and steadily growing in this country. As to the time of the day when this ceremony has to take place, there exists no doubt; it must be in the morning, for the simple reason that the blessing has to be followed by the Mass. But now the question arises, "What Mass is to be taken?" About this point there is a great deal of misunderstanding. Some are of the opinion that it must be the Mass of the Dedication, as contained in the latter part of the Missal; others that the Mass "of the day" must be said without any commemoration of the Mystery or of the Saint to whom the church is dedicated. Both of these opinions are wrong.

The wording of the Roman Ritual is, "dicitur missa de tempore occurrente vel de sancto."

De Herdt (*Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis III*, n. 289), explaining these words, says, "dicitur missa de tempore vel de sancto, scilicet de tempore vel de sancto de quo fit officium, non exclusa tamen libertate dicendi votivam, si dies permittat, quae in casu dicitur de sancto in cuius honorem ecclesia est benedicta."

This statement does not seem to be very clear, as the author does not say whether the votive Mass in this case is to be considered a *missa votiva solemnis* or a *privata*. Hartmann, in his *Repertorium Rituum*, takes the same view, namely, that a votive Mass in honor of the saint may be taken if the rite of the day allows it. The latest authority in rubrical questions, Bishop Van der Stappen, in the second volume of his *Sacra Liturgia*, is much clearer. He settles the question in my opinion beyond doubt, and in accordance with the decrees of the S. Congregation of Rites. He writes: "Dicitur missa de tempore occurrente vel de Sancto. Haec verba sequenti modo intelligenda sunt. Missa dicitur vel solemnis, vel cantata, vel privata, eodem ritu quo Missa Votiva solemnis ro pre gravi de Mysterio, vel de Sancto, in cuius honorem Ecclesia fuit benedicta. Ast, si eo die huiusmodi Missa non potest celebrari ob praestantiam festi aut officii occurrentis tum dicitur missa de occurrente festo aut officio. Nunquam autem potest dici Missa de Communi pro Dedicatione."

Consequently a solemn votive Mass with only one Oration, with Gloria and Credo and the last Gospel "In principio," is said in honor of the Mystery or the Saint to whom the Church is dedicated. The days on which this solemn votive Mass cannot be said are plainly enumerated in the respective rubrics on solemn votive Masses.

But is our author's decision to be accepted as a decisive and authoritative answer to the above question? It is, for it is in accordance with the decision of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The case was decided *in Neapolitana, die 23 Feb. 1884 (n. 3805)*: "Dubium II.—Rituale Romanum praecipit titulo benedicendi novam ecclesiam ut peracta benedictione dicatur missa de tempore vel de Sancto. Quaeritur: 1° De quo Sancto celebranda erit haec missa? De Sancto occurrente, an de Sancto in cuius honorem dedicatur Ecclesia? 2° Quatenus negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam, quo ritu celebranda erit, ut in secundo quaesito dubii praecedentis?" The answer was: "Resp.—ad dubium II. Quoad 1. *negative* ad

primam partem; *affirmative* ad secundam. Quoad 2. Ritu solemniori."

To leave no doubt about the meaning of the term "ritu solemniori" we add the words of the "dubium primum" to which reference is made. It had been asked "Quo ritu haec missa celebranda est, anne ut votiva solemnis pro re gravi exclusa omni commemoratione; vel ut votiva privata?" The answer was "*Affirmative* ad primam partem, *negative* ad secundam."

From all this we rightly conclude that the Mass to be sung or said after the dedication of a church must be a *missa solemnis* in honor of the Mystery or the Saint to whom the church is dedicated, except on days on which according to the general rubrics such a Mass is excluded.

MILWAUCHIENSIS.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE PAROCHIAL MASS.

In a Conference of the last number of the REVIEW we discussed the obligation of saying the Parochial Mass on Sundays without receiving any stipend for the same apart from the regular pastoral income. We stated that such obligation exists *de jure* in regularly constituted or canonical parishes. These do not exist in the United States, although there appears some doubt on this point with reference to the old French territory where the Council of Trent was supposed to have been promulgated at one time. A reader calls our attention to a note in Father Putzer's excellent *Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas, n. 113*, where he gives it as his decided opinion that the obligation does not exist in any of our dioceses, and cites a letter from the Vicar General of San Francisco to show that such is the common sentiment in the district referred to by him. The whole doctrine on the subject may be safely summed up in a declaration of the S. Propaganda, August 18, 1866, in which the obligation is expressed as "*decere* ex caritate," as distinguished from "*teneri* ex caritate," which latter form is not to be used in speaking of the subject.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. **Babel and Bible.**—We have had to refer to the Babel-Bible literature in former numbers of this REVIEW, and we believe we shall have to return to the same subject more than once. It was Professor Delitzsch, of Berlin, who started the controversy by a lecture delivered January 13, 1902, before the "Deutsche Orientgesellschaft."[1] At first, the lecture gained a certain amount of notoriety, because it had been attended by the German Emperor, and at his request was repeated on February 1, 1903, in the royal palace. But very soon it became the centre around which the battle raged between belief and unbelief. Professor Delitzsch delivered a second lecture on the same subject January 12, 1903, and published besides these two lectures learned notes on certain weak points of the question.[2] The Professor's views may be summed up in the following statements: (1) There exists a great similarity between the religious ideas of the Babylonians and those of the Old Testament. (2) From an ethical point of view, Babylon is superior to the Old Testament. (3) The contents of several of the Old Testament books are unworthy of God. Throughout his lectures the speaker inculcates the dependence of the Old Testament, and even of certain New Testament portions, on Babylonian ideas and models. He considers it one of the greatest errors of the human mind to see in the precious relics of Hebrew literature a religious canon, or a revealed book of religion. According to Delitzsch, instances of special resemblance between Babel and Bible may be seen in the struggle of God with the sea-monster, the cosmogony, the fall of man, the deluge, the decalogue, the ideas of heaven and hell, the significance of the Sabbath, the winged cherubim, and the divine name Yahweh.

The series of parallels between Babel and Bible was notably

[1] *Babel und Bibel.* Ein Vortrag. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1902. 4to, pp. 52.
[2] *Anmerkungen zu dem Vortrag Babel und Bibel.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

increased by Professor Zimmern, of Leipzig, in the second part of a publication which professes to be a third edition of Professor Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*.[3] The interest of the book is enhanced by the fact that it promises to elicit from the cuneiform inscriptions new light even for New Testament problems. Dr. H. Winkler, of Berlin, the editor, or rather the author, of the first part of the last-named publication, probably exceeds all other writers in equalizing Scriptural facts and persons with the incidents and personages of pagan mythology.—Professor Harnack, of Berlin, whose special domain has been hitherto supposed to be confined to ecclesiastical history, contributes an article to *The Contemporary Review*,[4] in which he takes exception to the German Emperor's Letter on Christ and Revelation published as a proof that his Imperial Majesty does not share Delitzsch's theological views. The Berlin Professor does not find it incongruous to place Jesus Christ in a line with Moses and Plato. "There cannot consequently be two revelations." And as to the divinity of Christ, "the Pauline saying, 'God was in Christ,' seems to be the last word which we can venture to utter." — Probably, Dr. George Aaron Barton, Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College, agrees with the position defended by Professor Delitzsch. In his book entitled *A Sketch of Semitic Origins, Social and Religious*,[5] the author successively considers the original home of the Semitic race, its primitive social life, its first religious notions, and the transformations of the primitive Semitic faith in Arabia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and Assyria. We need not say that the book offers more theories than solid proofs. — We may add here Mr. A. Holborn's *Pentateuch in the Light of To-Day*,[6] and A. G. Mitchell's *World before Abraham*,[7] though neither of these writers is explicit as to the Babylonian influence on the Old Testament. The latter work purports to be a critical commentary on the first eleven chapters

[3] Berlin: Reuther und Reichard. 1902–03.
[4] April, 1903, p. 554 ff.
[5] New York: Macmillan. 1902. Pp. ix—342.
[6] Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1902.
[7] Westminster: Archibald, Constable & Co. 8vo, pp. v—226.

of Genesis, and the former contains a course of ten lectures delivered to teachers in London under the auspices of the Sunday-school Union, for the purpose of outlining the modern critical conclusions as to the Pentateuch.

Attempts have been made to do away with the Old Testament historical books in the lower classes of colleges. "Away with the old truck," exclaims J. G. Dreydorff; "its retention is not only useless, but harmful."[8] R. Haasen too contributes to the *Monatschrift für höhere Schulen*[9] an article in which he endeavors to prove that the study of Old Testament history in the lower classes not only impedes the mental development of the students, but is detrimental to his ethico-religious training. Both contentions he illustrates by a number of instances. — The Rev. Buchanan Blake has written a study on the prophetical narrative of the Hexateuch in so far as it refers to Joseph and Moses.[10] The priest-codex on the one hand and the Deuteronomist on the other may be separated from the prophetical narrative without much difficulty; but even advanced critics find it hard, in certain portions at least, to divide up the prophetical narrative into its constituent parts J. and E. Mr. Blake, however, is courageous; he prints first the document E., then the document J., and to each he adds a commentary which is neither serviceable for devotion nor useful for critical study. The author is of opinion that the unlearned may still pick out his faith in the Bible, though it be neither free from error nor unexceptional in its morality.—The reader may be acquainted with George Adam Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, or with Canon Driver's *Sermons on Subjects Connected with the Old Testament;* Prof. G. A. Barton has given us a book of the same kind.[11] It strives to assist "those who would study the Old Testament devotionally" by showing how "many narratives of the Old Testament are powerful parables of Christian truth." The theories

[8] Quousque tandem? *Ein ernstes Wort wider den Alttestamentlichen Geschichtsunterricht.* Leipzig: H. Haessel. 1902. 8vo, pp. 41.

[9] October, 1902, p. 543 ff.

[10] *Joseph and Moses, the Founders of Israel.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1902. Pp. xxiv—265.

[11] *The Roots of Christian Teaching as Found in the Old Testament.* Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company. 1902. Pp. xii—271.

of early Semitic religion advanced in the author's *Semitic Origins* as well as the critical views of Old Testament topics are presupposed throughout.

2. Neutral Attitude.—Thus far we have considered publications of a rather negative attitude towards revealed religion. The following may be said to occupy a neutral field. Prof. George Stephen Goodspeed, of Chicago, has at length published his *History of the Babylonians and Assyrians.*[12] He begins with a brief, but careful account of the excavations in Mesopotamia; then follows a history of that land from the earliest times down to the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. The civilization, customs, manners, and religions of the peoples dwelling in Assyria and Babylonia are not forgotten. The tables of dates, bibliography, and indexes show evidence of accurate labor. The value of the book for the general reader is increased by an excellent map, which shows the lay of the country and the watersheds.—Professor Bezold too has recorded the chief and most important results of Assyriology without showing any polemic intention. His book is entitled *Ninive and Babylon*[13] and contains 102 illustrations; the number of illustrations is therefore only 41 less than the number of pages in the book. Among the neutral publications may also be classed Professor Delitzsch's lecture delivered April 24th before the "Deutsche Orientgesellschaft." He told his audience all about his journey to Babylon, March—October, 1902. His descriptions were accompanied by telling and beautiful photographic illustrations. No inroads seem to have been attempted into the field of theology. After the lecture the Emperor thanked Professor Delitzsch for his interesting entertainment.[14] Prof. Milton S. Terry gives us in his *Moses and the Prophets*[15] "an essay toward a fair and useful statement of some of the positions of modern Biblical criticism."

3. Conservative Attitude.—It is an encouraging sign of the times that most of the recent publications defend the existence of Divine revelation either in its entirety or in one or another of its

[12] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. xiii—422.
[13] Bielefeld. 1902. 8vo, pp. 143.
[14] Cf. *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, April 30, 1903, p. 5.
[15] New York: Eaton & Mains. 1902. Pp. 196.

parts. The Catholic reader will find Delitzsch's Babel-Bible theory discussed in the *Études*[16] by Father Condamin; in the *Pastor Bonus*[17] by Fr. Keil of London; in the *Stimmen*[18] by Fr. F. X. Kugler; in the *Catholic Mind* for April 22, 1903.[19] Among these writers, Fr. Kugler pays especial attention to Delitzsch's second lecture; neither his nor Fr. Condamin's series of articles is as yet complete.

L. W. King has published a work entitled *The Seven Tablets of Creation, or the Babylonian and Assyrian Legends concerning the Creation of the World and of Mankind*,[20] in which he almost completely restores the original Babylonian story, adding to the twenty-one of the previously published fragments twenty-eight that are now published for the first time. Among the latter is the tablet containing the story of man's creation. The work shows that there are points of contact between the Babylonian tradition and the Biblical cosmogony, and no apologist of revealed religion will deny the existence of these. At the same time, one is struck by the superiority of the Biblical record.—This last point has been most clearly brought out by Dr. Theophilus Pinches, in his work *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*.[21] The writer is certainly competent to speak on the present subject, and at the same time he can not be charged with any bias. He works down the Bible from the Creation without missing anything. He translates the tablets as he proceeds, and allows us to form our own judgment. The history of Babylonia in its relation to Israel is carried forward in such a way as to keep alive the interest of those who are historians rather than theologians. One becomes more and more convinced as one reads on, that the monuments can do very little in either making or solving Old Testament difficulties. They, no doubt, contribute a great deal to the history of religion, but they

[16] *La Bible et l'Assyriologie*, December 20, 1902; March 20, 1903.

[17] October, November, December, 1902; Fr. Keil gives in the *Pastor Bonus*, 6, 1903, a quite exhaustive bibliography of the Babel-Bible literature.

[18] April 21, 1903, p. 357 ff.

[19] *The Bible and Assyriology;* this is a translation from the French of Fr. Condamin's article.

[20] London: Luzac & Co. 1902.

[21] S. P. C. K., 1902; 8vo, pp. 520.

cannot claim to form a department in Apologetics.—Prof. Ed. König's pamphlet *Bibel und Babel*[22] has now reached its sixth edition; this shows, on the one hand, the interest that is still taken in the question brought to an issue by Professor Delitzsch's lectures, on the other the appreciation of the answer published by the Professor's great antagonist. König's work contains now a synopsis of the whole literature on the subject together with the new results of continued study of the Cuneiform Inscriptions. —Professor Budde, of Marburg, has also published a most noteworthy book,[23] in the first part of which he criticizes Delitzsch's *Babel und Bibel;* we believe the greater part of Old Testament students will agree with his strictures of Delitzsch's theories. But the main portion of the book is devoted to an examination of some of Dr. Winckler's views as set forth in the so-called third edition of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament.* Professor Budde energetically protests against several of Winckler's methods, especially his wholesale discovery of Babylonian solar or lunar myths in the period of the Patriarchs, the Judges, and even the earlier Kings.—This latter theory is briefly but soundly disposed of by Professor König, of Bonn, in an article, *The Latest Mythological Theory of the Patriarchs*, contributed to *The Expository Times* for February, 1903.[24] The learned writer refers us for a fuller treatment of the subject to his little work *Neueste Principien der alttestamentlichen Kritik.*[25]—Among the criticisms of Delitzsch's *Babel und Bibel* we may notice the words of Dr. Köberle, of Erlangen: "Babel may be of interest to us on account of the Bible, but the significance of the Bible does not lie in what comes from Babylon, but in that which is independent of Babel, that which goes beyond Babel, and which is directed against Babel." Professor Cornill, of Königsberg, though a critic of critics, wholly agrees with the preceding utterance: "Delitzsch's view is 'an exaggeration of the importance of Babel at the expense of the Bible, and theologians should vigorously protest against this position.'"—In a contribution to the *American*

[22] *Eine kulturgeschichtliche Skizze.* Sechste, erweiterte Auflage, mit Berücksichtigung der neuesten Babel-Bibel-Litteratur. Berlin: Martin Warnack.

[23] *Das Alte Testament und die Ausgrabungen.* Giessen: J. Ricker.

[24] P. 217 ff. [25] P. 34 ff.; 1902.

Journal of Theology[26] Professor Budde, of Marburg, again emphatically denies that the Hebrews had any such dependence upon Babylon for their ideas or their literature as was alleged by the Berlin Assyriologist. Babylonian literature may swell into infinity, but it will have nothing to equal our prophets, nor even the historical portions of our oldest sources. "We do not yet feel that the time has come to let our beautiful village be swallowed up over night, so to speak, by the metropolis of Babylon."

To these criticisms of Delitzsch's and Winckler's theories in their entirety we may add a number of exceptions taken to special parts of their systems. Prof. R. H. Charles writes in the *Expositor* for January concerning the rise and development in Israel of the doctrine of a future life. He shows that we must admit intellectual stages, indeed, but that we cannot explain the problem on a purely natural hypothesis. — George J. Reid treats in *The Catholic University Bulletin*[27] a subject akin to the foregoing. The reader may feel inclined to take exception to certain positions held by the writer; but he will feel his interest grow as he reads in the *Old Testament Conditions and Concepts of Earthly Welfare.* — In the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*,[28] Prof. Ed. König questions Winckler's statement that Yahweh is the name of a Canaanitish deity. This identification is based upon names in the Babylonian inscriptions belonging to the time of Hammurabi, and presupposes that the latter's dynasty was Canaanitish in character. But Jensen and others deny Winckler's view of Hammurabi's dynasty, and the names in the Babylonian inscriptions which most resemble Yahweh do not originally appear as proper names, but rather as attributes of the deity.—In a recent publication entitled *The First Bible*, Colonel C. R. Conder discusses the earlier forms and uses of writing in connection with our Old Testament books. Among other conclusions, he reaches the following: the Hebrews used tablets of brick and stone and cuneiform writing from the time of Moses down to about 600 A. D. — B. D. Erdmans contributed a study on the origin and the meaning of the Decalogue to the January number of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift.* We cannot fully agree with the writer in all his opinions on the question,

[26] October, 1902.

[27] April, 1903, pp. 225 ff.

[28] Heft 11.

but we sincerely endorse his thesis that the Decalogue is earlier than the days of Amos and Osee.—Prof. Francis Brown delivered before the last graduating class of Union Theological Seminary a lecture on *The Religious Value of the Old Testament* which has since then been published in a volume entitled *The Christian Point of View.* The lecturer points out the fact that Christianity presupposes the Old Testament, both its history and its prophecy. Jesus found spiritual life in it. The revelation in Jesus Christ alone determines what is perishable and what endures. — A thoughtful reader will be able to glean a number of facts for apologetic purposes from Prof. Samuel Ives Curtiss' recent work.[29] Beginning July, 1898, the author spent fourteen months continuously travelling over the territory subject to his research; again, in the summers of 1900 and 1901 he made further tours into new sections of the country. All this he did solely to ascertain whether in the religious customs of the present day there are any traces of the primitive religion.—In last year's December number of the *Monatschrift für höhere Schulen,*[30] H. Richert publishes a reply to the arguments advanced in a previous number of the same review against the study of Old Testament history in the lower classes of colleges. The March-April issue of the same publication[31] contains a reply to the same arguments from a Catholic point of view, written by Dr. W. Capitaine.—We are glad to notice also a German translation of the late Dr. Green's work on the Unity of Genesis.[32] This shows that there is a sufficient number of what may appear to be ultra-conservative Protestants even in Germany to render such a publication a promising enterprise.—At times, the traditional view as to the authorship of the Pentateuch has been denied on the ground that no such degree of culture as is implied in the writing of these books existed in the days of Moses. Now, Professor Hilprecht, of Philadelphia, has unearthed multiplication tables, grammars, text-books, evidences

[29] *Primitive Semitic Religion To-Day.* A Record of Researches, Discoveries and Studies in Syria, Palestine, and the Sinaitic Peninsula. Pp. 288. Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. 1902.

[30] Pp. 673 ff.

[31] Pp. 170 ff. 1903.

[32] *Die Einheit der Genesis.* Uebersetzt von Otto Becker. 8vo. Pp. xxx—765. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann. 1903.

of free-hand drawing, clay-modeling and sculpture, works of reference, scientific treatises, and various technical volumes on astronomical and religious subjects used five thousand years ago.[33] The same writer declares: "As the attempt has recently been made to trace the pure monotheism of Israel to Babylonian sources, I am bound to declare this an absolute impossibility on the basis of my fourteen years' researches in Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions." Dr. Jeremias too, though he is inclined to favor Delitzsch's theories, practically admits that the latter is utterly untrustworthy when he turns from the sphere of Assyriology to that of theology.[34]

[33] *Exploration in Bible Lands in the Nineteenth Century.* Edited by Professor H. V. Hilprecht. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman & Co. 1903.

[34] *Im Kampfe um Babel und Bibel.* Ein Wort zur Verständigung und Abwehr. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1903.

Criticisms and Notes.

BREVE APOSTOLICUM, "Actum Praeclare" SS.D.N. Leonis PP. XIII. Havanae: Apud Rampla et Bonza, typographos. MCMIII.

From Havana comes to us a magnificent edition of the Pontifical Brief in which the Sovereign Pontiff Leo XIII lays down the programme of ecclesiastical administration in the island of Cuba as the result of the investigation and official reports made to the Holy See by Archbishop Chapelle, who had been appointed Apostolic Delegate Extraordinary for that province.

It will be remembered that in 1901 the previous Spanish ecclesiastical legislation in Cuba was modified so as to bring the Church in the island under the same statutes as had been drawn up and approved for the Churches of South America (in the Latin American Council of 1899). Besides this the two very large dioceses of Cuba and Havana were placed under the jurisdiction of four bishops by the creation of Pinar del Rio and Cienfuegos, with Cuba (S. Jago) as the metropolitan see. The diocese of Porto Rico was separated from the old province, and is now under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See.

For the rest, the Brief of the Holy Father restored the *jus Cathedraticum* in lieu of the government support recently withdrawn from the episcopal office. Special stress is laid upon the training of a helpful clergy for the faithful of the islands; the priests are warned to keep out of politics; they are to live in harmony; to cultivate regular discipline by the renewal of spiritual exercises and by pastoral conferences; at least two students from each diocese are to be sent to the American Seminary (Pio Latino) in Rome, to be trained there for the Cuban mission. The Religious are exhorted to regularity, fervor, and missionary activity; missionary centres, whence priests may be ever ready to go out to preach retreats to the people, are to be founded wherever possible. In order that these things may be accomplished with a uniform purpose the bishops are advised to come together for friendly counsel.

The same Brief ordains that a provincial council be held, under the presidency of the Archiepiscopal Delegate, the acts of which are to

be submitted to the Holy See. The faithful are advised to live in concord, to coöperate with and obey their pastors, and to show proper respect to the representatives of the republic.

This Brief, which was issued in February of the present year, is now solemnly promulgated by a public act of the Apostolic Delegate in which he also sets forth the limits of the new dioceses. Two separate Decrees issued under the authority of Archbishop Chapelle are added to define the territorial and property rights of the two sees of Pinar del Rio and Cienfuegos, the locations and belongings of the cathedral and other ecclesiastical institutions. A third document deals with the canonical aggregation of three parishes belonging to the archdiocese of Cuba.

A large geographical map of the island of Cuba and two illustrations of the new cathedrals give to the publication of the Pontifical and archiepiscopal acts a specially practical value as well as an attractive appearance.

THE QUESTION BOX. Replies to Questions Received on Missions to Non-Catholics. By Rev. Bertrand L. Conway, of the Paulist Fathers. New York: The Catholic Book Exchange. 1903. Pp. 610. Price, $1.00 ($50.00 per hundred); Paper, 15 cents.

Although only a few years have elapsed since Father Hecker began the non-Catholic mission work, it has now developed into a highly-organized movement, with the whole body of the American priesthood enthusiastically promoting it, and the people nobly seconding their pastors' efforts. At the Catholic University there has been recently established a mission-house where the Bishops of the country send young priests to be trained as diocesan missionaries; and a quarterly periodical, together with a considerable number of books and pamphlets, gives evidence that the power of the written word has not been forgotten in enthusiasm for the spoken.

Father Conway's book—the latest addition to the literature of this movement—is built on a plan that he and his associates have conclusively demonstrated to be effective; it is a reasonable, practical, kindly, uncompromising presentation of those aspects of Catholicism most interesting to our fellow citizens outside the fold. The selection of questions and the framing of answers have been determined by wide experience in dealing with non-Catholic audiences representing every creed and none; in its very conception the book seems at once to be that for which a great many people have been seeking and for

the want of which, consequently, a great many of our priests have been not a little embarrassed. We rejoice that Father Conway has brought so capable a mind and pen to the accomplishment of the task laid upon him.

His book covers the whole ground of popular apologetic in an admirably concise yet not superficial way. It should interest every religious mind, and go straight to the heart of the earnest Christian. The author displays an ability for combining suavity and downrightness, simplicity and accuracy, sympathy and finality. He knows history, ancient and modern; he has carefully read the controversialists of both sides; and the word of Holy Scripture is ever on his lips. Barring a pen-slip, now and again (*e. g.* "Ad Scapulas," p. 219; "Jerome, the son of Napoleon," p. 308), his references and quotations give almost unalloyed satisfaction. Of course he has not attempted to go deeply into his expositions, nor to discuss every religious puzzle; his book leaves critical problems still unsolved, historical blots as black as ever, philosophical *cruces* still torturi ng thoughtful men. But as a neat handbook of ready and correct answers to the whole series of popular objections against Catholicism, *The Question Box* comes very near to being perfect, and its author deserves and will receive many a hard-worked priest's blessing for his precision and his thoroughness.

A HISTORY OF CATHOLICITY IN NORTHERN OHIO AND IN THE DIOCESE OF CLEVELAND. Vol. I.—Historical. By the Rev. George F. Houck, Diocesan Chancellor. Pp. 772. Vol. II.—Biographical. By Michael W. Carr, President of the Catholic Historical Society. Pp. 554. Cleveland: Press of J. B. Savage. 1903.

It is difficult, without having seen these two stately volumes, to form an adequate idea of the careful and splendid work which they represent. It appears that in 1899 Bishop Horstmann, himself a student and writer on historical topics, proposed the collection and sifting of data for the publication of a history which would present an accurate review of the Catholic missionary development in Northern Ohio. The labor of bringing together, of examining and comparing documents, was promptly undertaken by two men excellently qualified for the task. Father Houck, long a resident in Ohio and an official of the diocese whose habits of order and system have made his chancery a model in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs throughout the United States, undertook to collect and correct the material that pertained to the history of Catholicism in the district assigned. This

comprised an account of the Church, beginning with its earliest establishment in the territory of the Huron and Wyandot tribes, a full century and a half ago, down to our own day. It is a most interesting story, as are all the events connected with the planting of our holy faith, under circumstances which called forth the truest heroism from men who loved the cause of Christ and were willing to sacrifice their lives in the effort to make it known to others. Father Houck had already, as early as 1888, published a volume on the Church in Northern Ohio which, in a comparatively short time, ran to four editions. This sketch became the basis for the present much larger work, which contains all of interest that could be ascertained regarding Catholic missionary, charitable, and educational institutions, together with the documents which give to the narrative a distinctly historical value.

Mr. Carr, to whose cultured industry we owe the second volume of the work, has brought to his undertaking more than the accurate habit of the narrator who presents in chronological order the details which make up a series of eventful lives. He possesses the gift of the psychologist who pictures character, in addition to the spirit of the annalist who records the facts of history whence the lessons that render it useful as a study to posterity are to be constructed. "The mission and purpose of a biography," he says in his preface, "are to describe the spirit and acts of men, and thereby to instruct. It deals curiously with personal acts and facts, while its essence is the careful weighing of human character." Thus biography becomes not merely an adjunct of history, but rather its animating principle. The biographical series contains nigh onto two hundred sketches and notices of active missionaries in Ohio, headed by the five bishops who, since the time of Edward Fenwick's accession, have ruled in turn over the Diocese of Cleveland.

Without attempting here to gauge accurately the merits of the more characteristic features of this history, we feel confident that there is ample material in these two volumes for entertainment as well as for serious information. The work is published under the auspices of the Cleveland Catholic Historical Society, and likely to provoke emulation in future generations of readers who may be called to till in fields which have been cleared by the noble yet humble pioneers in the Northwest during the last century and a half. The two volumes are, we trust, on sale, so as to be obtainable by our Research Societies and by students of American history generally.

DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO. Praelectiones Canonicae quas habebat Julius de Becker, Rector Colleg. Americani Conc. B. M. V., Canon. Honor., Utriusque Juris Doct., Juris Canonici in Universitate Lovaniensi Professor ordin. Editio secunda, aucta et emendata. Lovanii: Polleunis et Ceuterick. New York: W. H. Young et Co. 1903. Pp. 552.

Dr. De Becker stands in the first rank of Canonists, and when some years ago he took up his most difficult subject of the "Jus matrimoniale," he was sure to render signal service to a very large class, not only of students, and of officers of the matrimonial curiae, but also to pastors and confessors, for whom a full and clear exposition of Church law and its application in various circumstances is a practical necessity. We expressed our appreciation of this valuable work on its first appearance, and are glad to hail the new edition, which contains a number of decisions and interpretations of recent date, notably in the matter of dispensations. The author has taken special pains to consult the Roman authorities in several important cases which needed such light, and has utilized the opportunities afforded him by numerous doubts proposed to him as an expert, to offer solutions which greatly facilitate the practical application of canon law to pastoral administration.

The American clergy have particular reason to welcome this work because it takes special note of our social and ecclesiastical conditions. Our code of applying dispensations, notably in the matter of marriages *mixtae religionis* and in cases of *disparitas cultus*, admits of a much wider interpretation than in Europe, where bishops hardly ever receive the faculty of dispensing from the last-mentioned impediment. Dr. De Becker is familiar with our circumstances, our practice, and our statute law. It is gratifying also to note how the theologians of the Old World have come in recent years to recognize the contributions of American ecclesiastical scholarship to the literature of pastoral and canonical science. Dr. De Becker pays generous tribute in his work to the service which THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW has rendered in this direction to the Clergy, not only of America, but everywhere. Perhaps it will not be amiss under these circumstances to refer here to the learned Canon's view of a question just now under discussion in these pages; we mean the case of the "Carentia ovariorum" regarded as a matrimonial impediment. Dr. De Becker, when he comes to treat of that question, refers to the opinions advanced by P. Antonelli and others. After calling attention to the celebrated case, "Causa Monaster. 10 Mart. 1899," he asks:

"Quid vero dicendum est si desit uterus, vel ille sit plane occlusus, dum, juxta leges naturales, adest communicatio inter vaginam et uterum? Quamvis acriter de hoc fuerit disputatum, etiam occasione Causae Monasterien. in nota indicatae, *retinendum plane est huiusmodi* defectus esse referendos ad sterilitatem, de qua postea, non vero ad impotentiam coeundi, cum validis argumentis haec sententia fulciatur, ac insuper ipsa merito provocare valeat ad decisionem S. Off. d. 30 Julii 1890 datam ad sequens dubium: 'Num mulier N. N. cui, operatione chirurgica, ablata sunt duo ovaria et uterus, admitti possit ad matrimonium contrahendum? Et, re mature perpensa, Emi. DD. Cardinales una mecum Inquisitores Generales decreverunt: Matrimonium non esse impediendum.' Illo responso quod diversis enervare cavillationibus, nonnulli, usque ad haec ultima tempora, inutiliter conati sunt, satisfit etiam solutioni alterius quaestionis, olim inter DD. disputatae, utrum, nempe, mulier excisa, cui utrumque ovarium fuit amputatum, habenda sit tamquam impotens ad matrimonium contrahendum. Quae quaestio ad hos terminos redacta iam fuerat proposita S. Off. d. 3 Febr. 1887, sub his verbis: 'Num mulier, per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum, sterilis effecta, ad matrimonium ineundum permitti valeat et liceat, necne?' Et prodierat solutio: 'Re mature diuque perpensa, matrimonium mulieris de quo, in casu, non esse impediendum.'"

How he interprets this decision is amply evident from a note appended to it, in which the reader is referred to the original argument of P. Eschbach.

"Praestat totam legere dissertationem quam, anno 1885, Cl. Eschbach inseruit in *Nouv. Rev. Theol.* et cuius conclusiones sic sonant quoad rem praesentem: "Dicendum est virum impotentem eum esse qui vel semen non conficit vel illud in foemineum vas deponere nequit; feminam autem quae debitum vas, vaginam scilicet, vel non habet, vel habet talem quae ingressum viri non patitur. Cetera in hoc genere saepe occurrentia, puta, seminis aut ovulorum infirmitas interna, prope uterum vaginae occlusio vel defectus (*non substantialis*, uti addendum putamus), ovariorum defectus vel prava conditio, etc., omnia et singula haec aliaque huiusmodi, ad sterilitatem referamus oportet, minime vero ad impotentiam sensu proprio intellectam," p. 305.

APOLOGIE DES CHRISTENTUMS. Von Dr. Herman Schell. Bd. I. Auflage II. Paderborn: Schöningh. 1902. Pp. xxxiv—482.

The ground-lines of Christian defence have been so long and habitually before us that one takes up a new book devoted thereto expecting to find in it the familiar method and arguments, varied only, if at all, in respect to matters of minor importance and detail. A glance at Dr. Schell's *Apologie* is rewarded by something more. One meets here, of course, with the central ideas and proofs common

to all apologetic—the existence of the supernatural, the necessity of revelation, the principle, criteria, miracle, and prophecy, and so on. There is, however, much other than this. About one-half of the volume is taken up with *Religionsphilosophie.* It is here that the author's originality, his appreciative sense of what the French call *actualité*, is manifest. The apologist of to-day has, of course, the same philosophical difficulties to contend with as had his predecessor of a generation and more ago; but the main problem confronts him now in subtler form. The study of comparative religion and the extension of the evolutionary hypothesis to the inclusion of the highest forms of consciousness have obliterated in many minds the appreciation of the supernatural and even the sense for the metaphysical. Religion has come to be confounded with religiousness, and thus to be accounted for as a mere psychological phenomenon, the resultant *of* a purely physical evolutionary process. It is, it seems to us, the principal merit and title to commendation in the present work that this interpretation of religion is analyzed and confuted. The attempt to explain religion as a resultant of fetishism or animism, as a creation of the poetic phantasy, as an effect of fear, as a product of egoistic propensities, as a manifestation of an innate groping after the infinite—theories such as these, each of which has had an influence on recent speculation and unfortunately on conduct, are here submitted to a searching criticism.

The second half of the book, which is devoted to the philosophy of revelation—the reasonability of faith, the criteria, the mystery of supernatural wisdom and sanctity—though covering familar ground, is treated none the less with that consciousness of the tendencies of the modern mind, with that sense of timeliness which, as we have said, so markedly characterizes the first part. As a recent German critic has remarked, Dr. Schell takes his apologetic position not outside the world, but in the midst of the world—in the world of the past and of the living present. He is in constant touch with the literature for and against his position as he holds frequent reckoning with its authors. To no inconsiderable extent he leaves the beaten paths. The wealth and originality of his thought find expression in a luxuriant fulness and variety of language. Greater simplicity in the latter respect, however, would have detracted in no wise from the elevation of his theme and would have lightened the work of the younger student, as well as those who have not mastered the infinite subtleties of German terminology.

Literary Chat.

In behalf of the Archæological Department of Public Education in the province of Ontario we are requested to ask possessors of a copy of the Ontario Archæological Reports of 1886–1887 and 1890–1891 that they donate these volumes to the Toronto Department in order to complete three defective sets of the Public Library.

Mr. W. D. Howells has very recently directed attention to a group of writers whom he designates as *Certain of the Chicago School of Fiction.* These, he believes, are "doing rather more than their share of the best literary work in the country" (*North American Review*, for May). He points out their peculiar powers of analysis and expression; and then suggests that they might do other, perhaps better, work. Miss Edith Wyatt could, he thinks, "apply her kindly and humorous imagination" to themes that touch high society rather than "the commonplace people she seems to prefer." Regarding Mr. Dunne he asks, how long he expects to keep on the mask of Mr. Dooley, and why he does not come into the open with a bold, vigorous and incisive satire of our politicians and their methods. And Mr. George Ade, who has chosen to teach our generation a thing or two in the style of the fable, should "give us that great American novel which we have been passing round the hat for so long."

With all due deference to the veteran litterateur's judgment as to what is best suited to our present needs, we should maintain that the three writers whom he singles out as representing the ability for superior work which might help to reform society, are doing better than Mr. Howells would plan for them; indeed we hope they will not take his advice. If Miss Wyatt's novels, *Every One His Own Way*, and *True Love*, exercise, as he claims, a real charm upon the average reader, we should rather see her reserve that charming art for the portrayal of those realities of life which awaken sympathetic chords in readers drawn from the middle society, than by seeking models among the *grandes dames* of society, who do not take life seriously.

As for Mr. Dunne's humorous impersonations of "Mr. Dooley," we doubt that "a bold, vigorous and incisive satire of our politicians and their methods" would have half the corrective value which is to be found in his present methods. We get enough satire, "bold and vigorous," and as incisive as *Puck* and others can make it, but none of it has elicited the general attention given to "Mr. Dooley." The same may be said of Mr. Ade. His method of clothing what he sees and hears in the form of fable is probably not so much the result of disposition as rather the device of a fertile brain, that recognizes it as the aptest way to secure a hearing which the so-called "tendency novel" only gains under very exceptional circumstances and with partial results.

There is room for writers amongst us, who, possessed of the native Irish wit and humor, sharpened by the power of a refined feeling and a broad education, can turn the penetrating spray of kindly sarcasm upon the starched novelists that make misrep-

resentations of the Catholic Church their stock-in-trade. These novelists portray monks, nuns, and priests in the fashion of the French and the Spanish writers who have succeeded to a great extent in creating suspicion and a thorough misunderstanding even among thoughtless Catholics of the real character of clerical and monastic institutions. Such literature needs to be counteracted by well-endowed pens.

And as a matter of fact it is nearly always possible to convict these writers of ignorance of the things about which they write; for they are bound to drag in *indulgences*, *Catholic ritual*, *monastic rule*, which are intended to give color to the malignant story, but of which they know nothing.

A new work dealing with the Papacy and the Byzantine Empire, beginning with Gregory VII and ending with the downfall of the Byzantine reign in 1453, is announced from the pen of Dr. Walter Norden, of the Berlin University. To the student of history, even if he should not sympathize with Dr. Norden's tendencies, the volume must be of decided interest inasmuch as it promises a considerable amount of original and documentary historical evidence gathered by the author in the MS. archives of Rome, Venice, Paris, Oxford. The question of the Primacy, the relation of the temporal to the spiritual power, and the position which Rome holds in the mind of the Greek Church are treated with special emphasis.

Among the Text-Books for Greek Classes in our Colleges and Seminaries we would recommend such selections from the early Christian writers as the "Address of St. Basil" *to the students of Greek Literature.* Mr. Edward R. Maloney (American Book Company) has published an excellent and handy edition of this choice bit of Christian classical writing, with grammatical references, notes, and vocabulary, to make it suitable for use in class. It is as good Greek as Xenophon's *Anabasis* which is used in most schools, and far better in thought and instructive matter. St. Basil shows what profit we may derive from the study of pagan literature and he exemplifies what he teaches.

If some educated woman with the faith, good sense, and tact of leadership, in each of our large parishes, were to send for a copy of the "Constitutions of the Archconfraternity of Christian Mothers," and study these, a new and strong spirit of womanly virtue would force itself into society, for a woman convinced of a need means a woman ready to fill it. A good Christian Mothers' Society in a parish—even if it had but half a dozen members— is a bulwark of Catholic education, of womanly virtue against which the modern frivolous self-indulgence would be driven like chaff, leaving no impression on the hearts protected by the wise charity of Christian Mothers.

It is to be hoped that the recent plan of Literary Honors inaugurated by the University of Harvard for encouraging the study of the classics in combination with that of the modern languages, as a means to develop a taste for literary pursuits, will arouse some sense of emulation among Catholic students. We are plainly deficient, not perhaps in literary talent but certainly in the training which makes of the literary habit a power. We have educated men and women who read, but few that write with

force and grace. The mastery of the classics, apart from the study of the Bible, undoubtedly accounts for much of the superiority that distinguishes certain English writers whom we affect to imitate in the schools. It should be remembered that there is much that is Christian in the best of the ancient classics, although we have also Christian writers who have thoroughly assimilated the classical proportion of thought and expression. These serve as models for developing character by imparting knowledge which improves not only the mind but also the gentlemanly instinct found in the youth who seek culture at College.

Fr. Pustet & Co. have printed on separate sheets the beautiful office of Our Lady bearing the title *Salus Infirmorum*, recited on the last Sunday in August. We believe this office is used by many priests in the United States: St. Louis, Milwaukee, St. Joseph, Kansas City, La Crosse, Leavenworth, Lincoln, Marquette, and Wichita.

The article on *Scholasticism* in the new edition of the *International Encyclopædia* (Dodd, Mead & Co.) is to be written by the Rev. F. P. Siegfried, of Overbrook. This is a guarantee of thoroughness, completeness and freedom from that scientific bias which so commonly mars the treatment of such topics by those who are not familiar or in sympathy with Catholic methods of defence. Father Siegfried has been for years the efficient editor of the Philosophical Department of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, and is a master teacher of his science in the truest sense of that word.

One of the best things which the *International Catholic Truth Society* of Brooklyn has done is the publication of selected catalogues, pamphlets and tracts issued by the various Truth Societies here and in Europe. A first list was published last October. This is now supplemented by a second issue. The fact that the scope and contents of each publication contained in the catalogue are given makes it of practical value to teachers of Christian Doctrine and to Catholic librarians.

Books Received.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

LA QUESTION BIBLIQUE chez les Catholiques de France au XIX. Siècle. Par Albert Houtin. Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils, Editeurs. 82, Rue Bonaparte, 82. 1902. Pp. ix—378.

VRAIE ET FAUSSE EXEGÈSE. E. Le-Camus, Evêque de la Rochelle et Saintes. Lettre aux Directeurs de mon Seminaire, àpropos du livre de M. Loisy, L'Evangile et L'Église. Paris: Librairie H. Oudin, 10 Rue de Meziéres, 10. 1903. Pp. 40.

BIBLE STUDIES. By the Rev. John F. Mullany, LL.D., Syracuse, N. Y. 1903. Pp. 21.

ÉVANGILE ET ÉVOLUTION: simples remarques sur le livre de M. Loisy, L'Evangile et L'Église. Par Abbé G. Oger, Ancien Directeur au Grand Séminaire de Soissons. Paris: Ancienne Maison Ch. Douniol, P. Téqui. 1903. Pp. xxii—47.

DIE PESCHITTA ZUM BUCHE DER WEISHEIT. Eine kritisch-exegetische Studie. Von Joseph Holtzmann. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung. Zweigniederlassungen in Wien, Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo. 1903. Pp. xii—152. Price, $1.45 *net.*

ZUR BABEL UND BIBELFRAGE. Erweiterter Neudruck aus der Zeitschrift "Pastor Bonus." Trier: Druck und Verlag der Paulinus-Druckerei. 1903. Preis brosch. Mk. 1.

DIE SCHOEPFUNGSGESCHICHTE DER MENSCHHEIT in der "voraussetzungslosen" Völkerpsychologie. Eine kritische Skizze von Dr. Josef Froberger, aus der Gesellschaft der Weissen Väter. Erweiterter Abdruck aus dem "Pastor Bonus." Trier: Druck und Verlag der Paulinus-Druckerei. 1903. Preis brosch. 60 Pfg.

THEOLOGY AND ASCETICA.

DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO. Praelectiones Canonicae quas habebat Iulius de Becker. Editio Secunda. Aucta et Emendata. Lovanii: Polleunis et Ceuterick 32, via Orphanorum, 32; New York; W. H. Young et Co. 63, via Barclay, 63. 1903. Pp. xii—552.

BREVE APOSTOLICUM "Actum Praeclare" SS. D. N. Leonis, P. XIII. Avanae. Apud Rambla & Bouza, Typographos. 1903. Pp. iii—3, xi—11, iv—4, v—5, ii—2.

DE LA CONNAISSANCE DE DIEU. Par A. Gratry, prêtre de l'Oratoire, Professeur de Théologie Morale à la Sorbonne, et Membre de l'Académie Française. Neuvième Édition. Tomes Premier et Second. Paris; Ancienne Maison Ch. Douniol, P. Téqui. 1903. Pp.: Tome Premier, xxii—467; Tome Second, 441. Prix, 8 fr.

THE FRIENDSHIPS OF JESUS. By the Rev. M. J. Ollivier, O.P. From the French by M. C. Keogh. With a preface by the Rev. Michael M. O'Kane, O.P. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 543. Price, $1.50 *net.*

THE OUR FATHER. Analyzed according to the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Rev. J. G. Hagen, S.J. Translated from the German by a Visitation Nun, Georgetown, D. C. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1903. Pp. 32. Price, $0.10.

INTROIBO. A Series of Detached Readings on the Entrance Versicles of the Ecclesiastical Year. By the Rev. Cornelius Clifford, Chaplain to the Religious of the Sacred Heart at Elmhurst. New York: The Cathedral Library Association. 1903. Pp. ix—304.

DE PERFECTIONE VITAE SPIRITUALIS. R. P. Antonii le Gaudier, S.J., Castro Theodoriciani. Accedunt duo opuscula: de SS. Christi Jesu amore et de vera Christi Jesu imitatione. Editio Recens Emendata. Tomus Primus. Augustae Taurinorum: Typographia Pontificia Eq. Petri Marietti, via Legnano, 23; Londinum: apud Thos. Baker, Bibliopolam Soho Square, 1. 1903. Pp. viii—599. Price, $2 per volume.

A LITTLE CHAPLET FOR THE QUEEN OF ANGELS, or A Short Meditation for every Evening in May. Dedicated to Rt. Rev. John E. Fitzmaurice, D.D., Bishop of Erie, the Friend and Patron of Letters, by the Author, Rev. B. J. Raycroft, A.M. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. 137. Price, $0.60 *net.*

PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY.

PRAELECTIONES PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE. Auctore P. Germando A. S. Stanislao. Volumen I. Complectens Logicam et Ideologiam. Fridericus Pustet. Pontificalis Bibliopola. Romae, Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci. 1903. Pp. 490.

PSYCHOLOGY. Empirical and Rational. Stonyhurst Philosophical Series. By Michael Maher, S.J. Fifth Edition. 30 Paternoster Row, London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co, 1902. Pp. xvi—610—xii.

INSTINCT AND INTELLIGENCE IN THE ANIMAL KINGDOM. A Critical Contribution to Modern Animal Psychology. By Eric Wasmann, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Pp. 171. Price, $1 00 *net.*

INDEX.

Roman Documents and the Decrees of the various S. Congregations will be found separately indexed under the heading "Analecta."

PAGE

ANALECTA.

PAGE

BOOK REVIEWS.