







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Getty Research Institute







543

AMERICAN  
Ecclesiastical Review

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FOR THE CLERGY.

Vol. X.

*" Ut Ecclesia aedificationem accipiat."*  
I Cor. XIV. 5.



PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
D. J. GALLAGHER & CO., PUBLISHERS,  
245-47 NORTH BROAD STREET.

THE GETTY CENTER  
LIBRARY



# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

---

VOL. IX.—JANUARY, 1894.—NO. I.

---

## CLERICAL STUDIES.

### EIGHTEENTH ARTICLE.

#### MORAL THEOLOGY.—(III.)—CASUISTRY.

THE knowledge of Christian duty is conceivable, and is to be found, as a fact, among men in two different shapes; the one natural and informal, the other logical and systematic. The former is common, in some measure, to all Christians; the latter, the privilege of the few, constitutes the science of moral theology.

Like all sciences destined to guide human action toward any given end, moral theology, as we have already observed, is based on general principles, formulated in rules of more limited range, and brought down, in the shape of specific cases, close to the individual actions which it is its purpose to regulate. General principles include all; but of themselves they supply only the most imperfect guidance. "Respect the rights of others" is the supreme and all-comprising law of justice. But what are the rights of others? And how is due respect shown them? And how far does it extend? To answer these questions minor principles and rules have to be laid down: "Respect his life; respect his property; respect his character, his freedom of action," etc.; while other rules define practically in what shape and to what extent respect has to be shown them.

So again the great law of charity. "Love one another," says our Lord. But it remains to determine in what measure and by what manner of action this love is to be shown. And so it is with all the great principles of the moral life. They are all clear in themselves, but they all need to be formulated in rules if they are to serve as standards of individual action.

This need was supplied originally by customs, later on by positive legislation, the result being a code of usages or laws by which right might be easily distinguished from wrong. But this method, while sufficient in most cases, was far from being so in all. Something of ambiguity often clung to the expressions of the law; doubts arose as to whether it was meant to extend to certain special cases; or the question was raised as to which should prevail of two laws that were in conflict, real or apparent, with one another. The difficulty was felt, not only in regard to positive, but also to natural law. Thus, truthfulness, for instance, is the acknowledged law of human intercourse; yet cases are occurring every day by the hundred in which it may be fairly questioned whether such and such modes of expression are, in the circumstances, truthful or not. The same may be said of almost every other law of duty.

This leads to new rules more precise and more particular still. But however much they may be multiplied to meet the ever changing circumstances, there will always continue to arise new cases in the combinations and in the surroundings of human actions, about which a question will remain whether they do or do not fall under one of these rules. To solve such questions is the business of the casuist. Each decision becomes in its turn a rule for similar cases, that is, entirely similar, because if similar only in some respects and different in others, a new case arises which may lead to a new decision.

This form of development is not proper to moral science: it is the outgrowth of all legislation. Wherever there is a code, casuistry of a kindred kind grows up around it. The numberless decisions, for instance, of the Congregation of

Rites are the casuistry of Liturgy. The very laws of good breeding give birth to a casuistry of etiquette. Indeed most of what is called law is scarce anything but casuistry. Until the period of its codification under the emperor Justinian, the Roman law was little more than a collection of "cases" or individual decisions, subsequently made into rules. Canon law was built exactly in the same fashion, that is, on pontifical rulings given on single cases. So also the common law of England, which, different from the statute law made by legislative enactments, rests entirely on the rulings of law courts and the opinions of eminent lawyers regarding single cases submitted to them. Statute law itself soon gathers around it a vast amount of similar cases which practically determine its interpretation, as may be seen in French, Belgian or Italian jurisprudence, or in the statutory jurisprudence of the United States.

This manner of development never comes to an end. New cases are ever arising to raise new doubts as to whether they do or do not fall under the common rule or law. The doubt is removed practically by the decision of a court, or by a legislative act, and for a short time matters flow on smoothly. But then comes a new case, not contemplated or not provided for in the previous decision. Is the difference essential or unimportant as regards the law? The question is raised and has to be decided. A new variety calls each time for a new decision, and as they are ever increasing with the very complexity of the law and of civilization in general, the work of legal casuistry has to go on forever.

Nor shall we find it to be different in regard to the Christian law. Christ Himself, while setting forth the great principles of the new life, vouchsafed to solve the cases of conscience put to Him by the Jews—how to deal with the woman caught in adultery—whether tribute might be paid to Cæsar, and the like. St. Paul in his Epistles solves a number of practical questions proposed to him by the faithful, or which he considered likely to perplex them. The Fathers are full of similar replies, and the Penitential Canons, which may be considered in a large measure as their

work, reflect faithfully the casuistry of the times in which they were established.

With the disappearance of the penitential discipline, the collection of canons, which had been hitherto the practical guide of confessors, gave way to a new form of manuals—the “*Summæ*” inaugurated by the great Dominican canonist, St. Raymund of Pennafort, continued, chiefly by the Franciscans, through the 14th and 15th centuries, and multiplied without end under various names in the following ages by all manner of theologians, secular and regular, but especially by the writers of the Society of Jesus.

Something of the science lingered in the Protestant churches during the 16th and 17th centuries; but, although one of the chairs in the University of Cambridge still bears the name, casuistry, as a systematic study, has disappeared from among them, partly for doctrinal reasons, but chiefly because they have discarded the practice of the confessional. The Ritualists in coming back to it have re-awakened an interest in the science, and many of them study it eagerly in Catholic manuals. The others are satisfied with what they find of it in the illustrations of moral philosophy, or in the ingenious essays of the periodical press, or in the problems discussed by the personages of modern fiction.<sup>1</sup>

In the Catholic Church the study has continued to be cultivated with unabated interest. It remains the most popular form of moral science, doubtless because no other is so practical. Casuistry, in fact, is in moral theology what therapeutics is in medicine, the very end and object of the science. To the student of moral theology it is indispensable for the proper intelligence of rules and principles. Hence we find it to-day the most living branch of the sacred science, spreading out into the various departments of human activity, old and new, and busy in applying the laws of Christian morality to every condition and every action of life. Wherever special duties bring with them special diffi-

<sup>1</sup> Englishmen claim, not perhaps without reason, that “*Boswell’s Life of Johnson*” is the best book of casuistry in the language.

culties and doubts, casuistry steps in to solve them. There is a casuistry for the lawyer, for the financier, for the journalist, for the public officer, for all, in short, who in their special need look for light and guidance to the Church. Like all things, even the best, it may have been occasionally abused ; it may have been diverted, unconsciously or deliberately, from its original purpose and made to subserve unworthy ends. But *abusus non tollit usum*. The fault was not in the science, but in those who misapplied it, and they were the few, and their worst mistakes were promptly corrected by the strictures of the Church. Even thus corrected it may not, for reasons to be mentioned later on, reach as high a level as might be expected under the law of the Gospel ; but if the bulk of Christians could only be led to live up to it as it stands, what a wonderful and blessed revolution the world would witness !

We have now to consider the share which individuals may be expected to take in sustaining, applying and completing this practical standard of Christian morality.

## II.

Scientific casuistry, such as it is taught in the schools, is the domain of theologians only and of students in theology. Unprepared by special training, the lay mind invariably misapprehends its positions and gets lost in it, as may be seen in the articles which occasionally appear on the subject in our secular periodicals. But informal casuistry is the privilege and the practice of every rational being. All day long men are passing judgment on the actions of their fellow-men and determining their moral value. Each individual is and has to be his own casuist in most things. At every turn of life he has to decide for himself questions of right and wrong. Yet, guided by the principles which he imbibed in early life, by the prevailing opinions of those around him, or by his native sense of good and evil, he generally pronounces without any hesitation. The more common difficulties he also disposes of with a little reflection. It is only in cases of

rare occurrence, or of special intricacy, that he feels seriously perplexed. But when these occur, unless he belong to the Catholic Church, the condition of such a man is deserving of the sincerest sympathy. Conscientious, yet distrustful of his own judgment; anxious to remain faithful to duty, yet unable to discern it clearly; craving for guidance, yet reluctant to seek it, or despairing to find it in the counsels of any other man, he may have to walk for years with faint heart and uncertain step until some providential circumstance, or the slow working of his own mind, shall have at length—if at all—dispelled the darkness.

In such cases a Catholic at once turns to the priest, with the full assurance of learning the truth or, at the least, of exonerating himself from any further responsibility. The priest is truly, at all hours, the casuist of his people, generally familiar with their difficulties and prepared to remove them. Yet he too will be occasionally perplexed; but an easy way out of his perplexity is usually open to him in the familiar casuistry of the schools. Just as lawyer and judge turn, in cases of difficulty to the opinions of jurists and to the rulings of courts; or as the physician, when his personal experience is insufficient, consults the standard medical authorities and follows their suggestions; in the same way the guide of souls turns in cases of difficulty to the authorities in his own science, the great moral theologians, taking up their original writings, or confining himself to the summary of their decisions to be found in the manuals familiar to all students of theology. To follow them is always a safe and prudent course, for they ordinarily represent the judgment of the best trained and most enlightened minds, the accumulated wisdom of ages, conclusions sanctioned and followed by men full of the spirit of God, the sense, sometimes, and it may be the decisions of the Church herself. To depart, on the other hand, from a course thus strongly and distinctly marked out, and follow, in its stead, personal speculations or fancies, would argue great thoughtlessness, not to say contempt, for authority, and would well deserve the note of presumptuous rashness.

We speak in general and having in view cases regarding which theologians are at one. But there are many in which they differ to such an extent, that they cannot be looked upon as guiding in any definite direction. Or the difficulty which occurs may be new to theologians, as happens in the interesting case of "Ectopic Pregnancy" presently before our readers; or, like the question of hypnotism, it may have been touched only by a few. Besides, most moral rules, such as they are formulated, admit of exceptions: *v. g.* obedience to parents; avoidance of scandal, etc. Then precepts are frequently qualified by some extrinsic, accidental reason of necessity, advantage, pressure of some other duty, and the like, but only the principal and more common cases of exception have been or could have been defined by theologians. Or again, grave doubts may have arisen as to the solidity of the grounds upon which a certain manner of action was commonly held to be forbidden, and, as a further development, even the practice may come to be indulged in without much (if any) scruple by a portion of the community, notwithstanding the protest of theologians, as happened, for example, in the determination of prices, or the interest of money.

In all these cases, besides many more, casuistry itself with its numberless ramifications is an insufficient guide, and the inquirer, thrown back on his own resources, has to choose and to decide for himself, just like the judge who, on certain occasions, finds only contradictory precedents, or no precedent at all to go by.

It may not be amiss to consider briefly how the work of moral guidance may be still carried on in such circumstances by the priest whom we supposed to have been appealed to. To deal with the matter thoroughly, it would be necessary to open up the whole question of the value of casuistry, as it is found in the schools, of its rulings and its grounds, and of the varying degrees of certitude or probability which they offer. But this must be reserved for some other occasion. For the present we shall confine ourselves to conclusions, and even these of a general kind.

1. When a confessor finds theologians divided on any practical subject regarding which he has been consulted, first of all he is under no necessity of making up his mind in one sense or the other. So long as no reflex principle occurs to transform the doubt into a practical obligation, he may consider the inquirer as free to do as he likes. If he wishes to reach a personal judgment on the subject, he must weigh the authorities and the reasons on both sides, such as he has been able to ascertain them. It is by no means presumptuous in persons of average ability to hope to reach the truth with certainty, even where great minds are hesitant and divided. We claim to do so every day in similar questions of philosophy and of religion. The judgment, of course, will mostly follow the natural bias of the man. According as he is of a speculative or of a practical turn of mind, strict or lenient, he will lean to one side or the other. Sometimes a single theologian whose authority or wisdom he reveres will be decisive with him, or a recondite harmony felt by him between one of the contending views and his own philosophical or practical tendencies.

Even though his reflections may lead the confessor to a conviction of the existence of the obligation, he cannot compel his penitent to be guided by it. He may, indeed, apprise him of his personal conviction and exhort him to follow it, especially if he feels that it would be more beneficial to him to do so. But it may be that such an intimation would only serve to disquiet or dishearten him, in which case it were clearly better to abstain.

2. The same may be said of newly moved questions, so long as no authoritative decision, nor common agreement, nor conclusive reason has settled them speculatively or practically. An obligation, until it attains to consistency in the mind, either by inner development or by contact with reflex principles, can have no firm hold on the conscience.

3. General precepts, we have said, are liable to limitations, and one of the greatest difficulties of moral theology is to establish them properly. Take, for example, the duty of restitution. It ceases, theologians tell us, in presence of a



moral impossibility. But what, it will be asked, constitutes a moral impossibility? And in reply a certain number of rules or examples are given us, all helpful because they offer something definite so far as they go. But they do not, they can not, cover the whole ground. There are hundreds of cases which they leave untouched. How is our confessor to solve those he meets? In various ways. First, if he be inexperienced or distrustful of his own judgment, he will submit the case to another more competent. Or he may be guided by comparison or analogy. Considering the "causae excusantes" commonly admitted, he will examine whether that appealed to in the present instance is of equal importance, and if so, he will look upon it as valid. It is in this fashion that most of the difficulties under consideration are practically solved. If there is question, for example, whether such and such reasons dispense from fasting, from attending Mass, from relieving a person in need, from giving warning of danger, etc., the mind instinctively turns to reasons which are commonly considered a sufficient excuse, and by them forms some estimate of the dispensing value of the others.

Finally, as a matter of taste or as a matter of necessity, the confessor may go back to first principles, consider what gives rise to the obligation and whether the purpose of the law would be defeated or notably diminished if the reasons alleged were to be admitted as an excuse. Thus a certain degree of necessity might seem sufficient in some special cases to justify a man in making free with the property of another; but if by admitting such a reason it is felt that property itself would lose that security to which it owes its principal value, that reason is to be held insufficient.

4. The last case to be considered is that of a strong current of opinion running counter to the teachings of the schools. It is a case of especial difficulty, not however equally so in whatever matter it may happen. Thus, if the opposition arises and develops in regard to a positive law, it generally leads to a gradual weakening of the latter, ending in its abrogation by desuetude. But while the process goes on,

there is room for every degree of responsibility, from deliberate guilt to entire blamelessness, according to the stage which the opposition has reached and to the state of conscience of those who join in it.

Again, in all matters of justice, customs generally accepted have a much greater share in determining the measure of right and wrong than any abstract principles, the reason being that each one is supposed to consent to any limitation of rights established by the common practice of the community to which he belongs. In its earlier stages the custom is not strong enough to prevail against the rule of abstract right represented by theology, but where it has finally prevailed, theology has to accommodate itself to it.

The real difficulty is reached when we come to the decisions of casuistry which are supposed to rest on immutable laws, natural or divine.

If these decisions were to be considered infallible, that would end the question; no opposition to them, speculative or practical, would be of any avail. But casuists, even where agreed, are not infallible. They may not even be certain; for men may agree, and do agree in almost every branch of knowledge in adopting certain views and theories, not as demonstrated, but as the most plausible they can find. Hence casuists, like scientists, or like our courts of justice, even the highest, sometimes change their practice. Opinions unanimously held for a time are dropped; others, long objected to, prevail. Their authority, therefore, even when they agree, is a variable quantity—greater when they permit than when they forbid, greater when they lay down principles than when they draw conclusions, or apply them to special cases. A single dissentient voice, if it be one of weight, lessens their authority in a considerable degree<sup>1</sup>. It follows that in the case before us no absolute rule can be laid down. Speculative principles and practical necessities,

<sup>1</sup> See on all this subject:—Bouquillon, *Theol. Fundamentalis*, Introd. n. 63 et seq. Melch. Cano, L. viii. Franzelin, th. xvii. Zaccharia, *Diss oleg.*, op. S. Ligorii, etc.

the judgment of theologians and the common sense of the Christian community, authority and reason, all have to be listened to, and whatever the conclusion, if only prudence has guided the deliberations, due homage has been paid to the supremacy of the moral law.

We have supposed a sort of popular opposition to some decision of moral theology. But what is to be thought of individual opposition?

Pretty much what would be thought of it in any other matter. Men of only average ability who, in a matter of technical knowledge, choose to antagonize what is universally held by those of the profession, or who, in things of general interest, run counter to the common sense of their contemporaries, generally get credit for more courage than wisdom. So in theological matters, dogmatic or moral, to depart from the common teaching is rightly looked upon as rash and presumptuous. Yet what is denied to the many may be allowed to the few. In every sphere of knowledge, men of deep thought and powerful intelligence see farther than the crowd. They have broader and loftier intuitions of truth; subtle inductions and deductions, the correctness of which ordinary minds are slow to recognize, yet ultimately acknowledge. This is what makes them leaders of thought. As such they are privileged, and no fault is found with them if they occasionally depart from the beaten tracks.

The remark applies to the human element of theology as well as to the rest of human knowledge. Theology progresses by correcting what is mistaken as well as by expounding what is true, and it belongs to those who stand highest in the science to originate new departures. One cannot but be struck by the modesty and caution with which the greatest theologians have availed themselves of the privilege, putting forth their views in a tentative way, as hypotheses, convenient solutions and the like, and awaiting the encouragement, or at least the acquiescence, of the schools before venturing farther. The door once opened by them, less difficulty was felt to let others follow. "Unicus auctor," says Zaccharia (Dissert. prob. in Lig. cap. v, can. v),

“si sit omni exceptione major, afferatque rationem quam alii non considerarint, vel non satis solverint, ipse autem aliorum rationes commod solvat, quamvis doceat contra communem, poterit reddere opinionem probabilem.”

Such is casuistry, as established by theology and as applied by the Catholic priest. What priest and people owe to it of fulness, distinctness and accuracy in the knowledge of duty; what follows, on its use, of peace to the mind and vigor to the will, is simply incalculable. It has its imperfections and its disadvantages, upon which our space does not permit us to dwell here. Happily, as we shall see, they may be extenuated indefinitely; but even untouched, they are as nothing compared with the advantages of a science which has always gathered its chief inspirations from faith in the Church, reverence for God and pity for human weakness.

JOHN HOGAN.

*Catholic University, Washington, D. C.*

---

## THE DISCUSSION OF A NEW MORAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL PROBLEM.

TESTIMONY OF THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.

### INTRODUCTION.

IN the issue of November, 1893, the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW opened the discussion of a new moral and physiological problem. Three eminent theologians had contributed their solutions, but as the evidence on the physiological side had not yet been completed, no precise estimate could be formed of the value of these solutions, so far as they rested upon the data furnished by the medical profession. These we promised to set before our readers, and to-day we are enabled to give not a bare summary of the evidence, but the full testimony of the distinguished specialists, who have shown themselves so ready to communicate the results of their deep study and extensive practice. As the question is

moral as well as physiological, and comes within the range of the REVIEW chiefly on account of its moral aspect, a brief statement of the ethical principles which underlie the solutions may not prove unacceptable just at this point to the reader.

1.—In order that an action may be truly righteous, it must be good from its inception to its consummation ; that is to say, the object or specific purpose of the act, as well as the particular end held in view by the agent, must be legitimate ; moreover, the circumstances must be such that no right be violated. Thus, to relieve indigence is a noble work, but to do so in order to bribe voters, or with money to which others have a prior or superior claim, is wrong : in the one case, the intention of the giver, in the other, the neglected claims vitiate an act which, prompted by better motives or performed under different circumstances, would be entirely praiseworthy. Hence the old axiom : *Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quocumque defectu.*

2.—No end, however legitimate, however excellent, can justify a resort to means that are in themselves wrong. Thus it is unlawful to take the life of an innocent human being even to save a whole nation. The man who said : "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and the whole nation perish not," was already in his heart a murderer. There is, however, a great difference between killing *directly*, that is, by an act which is life-destroying or homicidal in itself, and causing the death *indirectly*, that is, by an act which has quite a different purpose, but which *accidentally* entails the loss of innocent lives. A general who, *in a just war*, destroys the defences of a city by artillery fire knows very well that some non-combatants shall lose their lives, yet his act is lawful ; but it would be quite a different matter if he trained his guns on innocent women and children, in order to compel the defenders to surrender at discretion. In the former case the taking of the city would be the object *directly* intended, the death of innocent persons would be a sad but accidental circumstance ; in the latter case, the murder of women and children would be *directly*

intended, and all the waters of the ocean could not wash away the blood stains from the hands of the inhuman butcher. In opening, either with an incandescent or with a cold knife the cyst which contains an embryo, does the physician kill the unborn child *directly*? or does he directly arrest the hemorrhage and indirectly cause the death of the embryo? This is a moot question which we shall not attempt to decide.

3.—If an action, good in its object, in its purposes and in its circumstances, happen to have two effects, the one good and intended, the other bad but not intended, the act is justifiable, provided (*a*) that it be necessary, (*b*) that the good overbalance or, at least, compensate the evil, (*c*) and that the evil be not *a means* toward the end, but only an adjunct which cannot be avoided. It is not allowable to kill the child in order to save the mother, or to kill the mother in order to save the child, but it is permissible and sometimes necessary to give the mother a drug which has for the mother a curative power, although it may at the same time cause a premature birth. But the drug must have a real therapeutic value and not cure the mother *solely* by causing abortion. If all the conditions above mentioned are fulfilled the good effect is intended directly, the bad effect is only permitted or tolerated.

4.—A being consisting of body and soul substantially united is a man, however undeveloped that man may be. At every stage of its life natural and inborn rights cling to it, even though it cannot exercise or enforce them. Both divine and human laws acknowledge these rights, and when the natural protectors are unable or unwilling to perform their duties, guardians are appointed by the proper authority, and receive the trust which parents or relatives should, if possible, have discharged. Hence it would be immoral to ignore the rights of helpless human beings under the pretence that they cannot by themselves exercise their rights. A baby is not a *thing* but a *person*; a fully formed embryo has already an immortal soul.

5.—The right of self-defence may go so far as to justify a

man whose life is threatened, in injuring or even killing the unjust aggressor. The ethical foundation of self-defence is this: Justice requires a sort of moral equation, and if a right prevails it must be superior to the right which it holds in abeyance. At the outset both the aggressor and his intended victim have equal rights to life, but the fact of the former using his own life for the destruction of that of a fellow-man places him in a condition of juridic inferiority with regard to the latter. If we may be allowed so to express it, the moral power of the aggressor is equal to his inborn right to life, less the unrighteous use which he makes of it, whilst the moral power of the intended victim remains in its integrity and has consequently a higher juridic value. When the person assailed cannot defend himself his right *can* and sometimes *must* be exercised by those who are bound in justice or charity to protect the innocent. At the dawn of human life the physician or surgeon stands as the natural protector both of the mother and of the child; he is beholden to both.

6.—The right of self-defence is not annulled by the fact that the aggressor is irresponsible. The absence of knowledge saves him from moral guilt, but it does not alter the character of the act, considered objectively and in itself; it is yet an unjust aggression, and in the conflict, the life assailed has yet a superior juridic value. The right of killing in self-defence is not based on the ill will of the aggressor but on the illegitimate character of the aggression. Now, an aggressor is *at least materially unjust* whenever he perpetrates an act destructive of the right of another. In normal pregnancies the child, although unconscious, has an inborn right to reach the exterior world by the way that nature has marked out for it: no juridic inferiority can arise from the fact that in using its right in accordance with the law of Nature, it accidentally imperils its mother. But when it attempts to cut another way not intended by nature, at the expense both of the life of another and of its own, can it be *materially right*? Is it not *materially an unjust aggressor*? When we speak of *ectopic* gestation, this is probably the very heart of the question.

7. In doubtful cases, the abnormal is not to be *assumed*, but *must be demonstrated*, according to the legal axiom: "In dubio, judicandum ex communiter contingentibus." Hence, if a growth be certainly *ectopic*, it is not to be assumed that it contains a foetus. This does not mean that it can be treated at once like a malignant tumor, for nobody can expose himself wantonly to the danger of destroying a human being; but it goes to show that in cases of extreme peril, and when it is necessary to take a decision or to let a mother die, the uncertain right of an undefined boggy mass, cannot annul the evident right of a rational human being. We suppose that every known means to arrive at correct diagnosis has been used but without satisfactory results, and that the life of the mother depends on a prompt decision on the part of the doctor; this case is not uncommon in ectopic pregnancies; when it occurs, *judicandum est ex communiter contingentibus*.

These principles are easily understood, and generally admitted, but their application is often difficult and must rest on well established facts. Is it possible to save both the mother and the child? Is the physician sometimes compelled to act before the diagnosis is completed? Are the means used to relieve the mother truly *remedial*, or indirectly so through the death of the foetus? The answers to these and to similar questions depend on facts which must be ascertained by expert testimony. In order to obtain the needed information, the editor of the REVIEW sent to several physicians of known ability the following letter:

EDITOR'S ROOMS,

"AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW."

DEAR SIR:

Desiring to obtain information with regard to ectopic pregnancies from medical experts of acknowledged standing, in order to solve some important ethical problems, I beg leave to submit for your careful consideration and reply the following questions:

[As the distinction of *primary* and *secondary* ectopic pregnancies, however important for the surgeon, does not bear directly on the solution of special moral problems, we waive its consideration here,



as well as that of pregnancies which may take place in the horn of a bifid or bilobed uterus or in a hernial sac. We assume that the acknowledged types are : *Interstitial, Tubal, Ovarian, Tubo-ovarian, Tubo-abdominal, Intra-ligamentous, Abdominal.*]

FIRST QUESTION.—In what form or forms of abnormal pregnancies can the child be produced alive, through natural or artificial passages, without killing the mother or positively endangering her life ?

SECOND QUESTION.—During pregnancy, at what time and by what means can a differential diagnosis be made between *intra* and *extra-uterine* pregnancy, and between abnormal gestation and pelvic or other tumor ?

THIRD QUESTION.—Before such a diagnosis can be made, is it sometimes imperative to destroy or remove the growth in order to save the mother ?

FOURTH QUESTION.—Does electricity destroy the life of the foetus or the vitality of the growth as certainly as the knife of the surgeon, and with as much safety to the mother?—Suppose that the foetus has been destroyed by electricity, say at the third month of tubal pregnancy, is the mother in as safe a condition as though the foetus had been removed by the surgeon ?

FIFTH QUESTION.—Should laparotomy reveal the fact that the growth contains a real foetus, is it advisable to puncture the membranes, remove the growth entirely, or is it preferable to use the incandescent knife to open the membranes so as to give the foetus a chance to live if but a few moments ?

SIXTH QUESTION.—When the child is alive, having reached, or nearly reached, its full term (in intra-ligamentous or abdominal pregnancies), can it be saved?—Should the physician wait until it is dead in order to avoid certain complications ?

By answering the above questions, and permitting the use of your name in connection with the answers, you would greatly oblige us.

Respectfully,

“THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.”

The eminent men who received this appeal responded with a liberality and a scientific thoroughness which cannot be too highly appreciated. This is the list of our kind and learned contributors, the names are disposed in alphabetical order :

- T. A. Ashby, M.D.,  
Professor of Diseases of Women, Baltimore Medical College.
- B. F. Baer, M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology, Philadelphia Polyclinic Hospital and College  
for Graduates in Medicine.
- J. Portman Chesney, M.D.,  
Professor of Obstetrics, North-Western Medical College, St. Joseph, Mo.
- E. C. Dudley, M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology, Chicago Medical College.
- L. H. Dunning, M.D.,  
Professor of Surgical and Clinical Diseases of Women, Medical Department  
of Indiana University.
- J. M. Emmert, M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology and Clinical Gynaecology, Iowa College of  
Physicians and Surgeons.
- Thomas Addis Emmet, M.D., LL.D.,  
Surgeon to the Woman's Hospital, Physician to Roosevelt Hospital, etc.,  
etc., New York City.
- Henry D. Fry, M.D.,  
Professor of Obstetrics, Georgetown University.
- William Goodell, M.D.,  
Emeritus Professor of Gynaecology, University of Pennsylvania.
- James Weir Heddens,  
Professor of Gynaecology, Ensworth Medical College, St. Joseph, Mo.
- Robert P. Harris, M.D.,  
Philadelphia.
- A. A. Henske, A.M., M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, St. Louis College of Physicians  
and Surgeons; Physician in charge of St. Anne's Lying-in Hospital.
- Barton Cooke Hirst, M.D.,  
Professor of Obstetrics, University of Pennsylvania.

1 The opinions of Dr. T. Addis Emmet are also those of his already eminent son, Dr. Duncan Emmet.—C.

Joseph Taber Johnson, M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology, Georgetown University.

Howard A. Kelly, M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.

J. E. Kelly, M.R.I.A., etc., etc.,  
Professor of Operative Surgery and Gynaecology, Post-Graduate Medical  
School, New York City.

C. Henri Leonard, M.D.,  
Professor of Medical and Surgical Diseases of Women and Clinical Gynaecology, Detroit College of Medicine.

W. T. Lusk, M.D.,  
Professor of Obstetrics and Diseases of Women and Children and Clinical  
Midwifery, Bellevue Hospital Medical College, New York.

T. J. McGillicuddy, M.D.,  
Surgeon in charge of the Mothers' Home, Maternity Hospital, of the Dis-  
pensary and Hospital for Women and Children, etc., etc.,  
New York City.

Matthew D. Mann, A.M., M.D.,  
Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Buffalo.

E. E. Montgomery, M.D.,  
Professor of Clinical Gynaecology, Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia.

J. F. Moran, M.D.,  
Demonstrator in Medical Department, Georgetown University.

R. B. Maury, M.D.,  
Professor of Gynaecology, Memphis Hospital Medical College, Memphis,  
Tennessee.

L. E. Neale, M.D.,  
Professor of Obstetrics, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Baltimore.

Charles P. Noble, M.D.,  
Surgeon-in-chief Kensington Hospital for Women, Philadelphia.

Michael O'Hara, M.D.,  
Philadelphia.

William H. Parish, M.D.

Professor of Anatomy, Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania.

Joseph Price, M.D.,

Obstetrician to the Preston Retreat, Philadelphia.

Mordecai Price, M.D.,

Philadelphia.

C. E. Ristine, M.D.,

Professor of Obstetrics and Clinical Gynaecology, Tennessee Medical College, Knoxville.

J. F. Roderer, M.D.,

Philadelphia.

George H. Rohé, M.D.,

Maryland Hospital for the Insane, Baltimore, President of the American Association of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

P. Gourdin De Saussure, M.D.,

Professor of Obstetrics, State Medical College, of S. Carolina.

Henry Schwarz, M.D.,

Professor of Gynaecology, St. Louis Medical College.

I. S. Stone, M.D.,

Professor of Gynaecology, Georgetown University.

Lawson Tait, M.D., F.R.C.S., LL.D., etc., etc.,<sup>1</sup>

Professor of Gynaecology in Queen's College, Birmingham, England.

T. Gaillard Thomas, M.D.,<sup>2</sup>

Author of "Diseases of Women and Abdominal Surgery."

These are the eminent men who have given us the benefit.

1 Dr. Lawson Tait replied at once to the Editor's letter, but stated that the answers to all the questions could be found in his book on "Ectopic Pregnancy and Pelvic Haematocele." As the work is well known, and, as moreover, Dr. J. F. Roderer, of Philadelphia, adopts as his own opinion substantially those of the celebrated English surgeon, but few quotations have been taken from the latter's book.—C.

2 Most of these eminent men simply added M.D. after their names; we had to know *aliunde* that both Dr. Lusk and Dr. Thomas had written masterly works on Gynaecology.—C.

It is our bounden duty to acknowledge our obligations to Professor J. W. Chambers, M.D., of the Baltimore College of Physicians and Surgeons, who, with a patience and cordiality equal to his great skill, has imparted to the compiler the information necessary to accomplish his task.—C.

of their knowledge and experience ; they require no commendation from us ; some of them are as well known in Europe as in this country. Their testimony is given in their own words. When something had to be added to supply the absence of the context, the addition has been put within brackets. Such a mass of evidence, coming from so many sources, would have become unwieldy, and almost unavailable, had not some sort of classification been adopted. For the sake of perspicuity, marginal titles have been introduced to point out the leading topic treated in the answer or set of answers to which they are affixed. These titles joined together will be found to form a continuous text which marks the trend of the discussion. Of course the answers overlap one another, but this inconvenience could not have been avoided without mutilating the text of the contributors. Some foot-notes have been added—those due to the compiler are followed by the letter C.

The questions follow in order.

#### FIRST QUESTION.

*In what form or forms of abnormal pregnancies can the child be produced alive, through natural or artificial passages, without killing the mother, or positively endangering her life.*

Dr. John F. Roderer.

“In all forms of ectopic pregnancies can the child be extracted without immediately causing the death of the mother. If viable, the child will probably live. In *all* abdominal sections there is great risk to the mother. In operations before the time of rupture, that is, between the 12th and 14th week, there is not as great danger to the mother as when the operation is done when the foetus has reached the sixth or seventh month. Then the existence of the placenta complicates the case.”

In all form it is possible to produce a live foetus, but there is danger for the mother in every case.

Dr. Matthew D. Mann.

“It is perhaps possible for a child to live until it has reached a viable age and then be born alive, with the aid of the knife, in any of the forms described above ; though in some

of them it has never been observed. In such operations the mother stands a great chance for her life."

Dr. Joseph Price,  
Dr. T. J. McGillicuddy.

"In all forms."

(Dr. Jos. Price, records 85 abdominal sections for ruptured tubal pregnancy with 3 deaths, the 3 deaths due to delay.<sup>1</sup>)

Dr. E. E. Montgomery.

"In all forms of abnormal pregnancy there are cases on record in which the child lived to viability and in some of which the operator has been successful in delivering a living child and in saving the mother. In some cases of interstitial pregnancy, the rupture has occurred into the uterine cavity, permitting the escape of the foetus and its envelopes, and its subsequent development therein becoming a normal pregnancy."

Dr. L. H. Dunning.

It is believed that interstitial pregnancy sometimes results in spontaneous delivery; but laparotomy is, usually at least, indispensable; and the mother's danger is very great.

"Interstitial pregnancy, it is believed, may sometimes result in spontaneous delivery.<sup>2</sup> A few cases are on record of abdominal and intra-ligamentous pregnancy in which abdominal section has resulted in saving both the life of the mother and child, though operation has been very dangerous to the mother on account of dangers of hemorrhage."

Dr. Henry Schwarz.

"In no form of ectopic pregnancy can the child be produced through natural passages, but it may in all cases be produced by laparotomy. The life of the mother is always endangered."

<sup>1</sup> This is a splendid record! If the infants were brought out not only *living* but *viable*, then the problem is solved with regard, at least, to abdominal pregnancies.—C.

<sup>2</sup> According to the researches of Dr. Zmigrodzki, extra-uterine pregnancy, even when no operation is performed, is not necessarily fatal: in tubal pregnancies 17 per cent., in abdominal pregnancies 50 per cent. end in spontaneous recovery." (Dr. Joüon, *Grossesse Tubaire*, p. 53.) This may be true, but Dr. Zmigrodzki does not say how many *ova* reached the embryonic stage and what became of the embryos.—C.

Dr. J. Portman Chesney.

"In abnormal gestations, confined within the bounds of your own definition, the life of the mother is menaced *always*, without exception, by the mere fact of the pregnancy; death may be a remote contingency, but the danger is ever present, and is scarcely lessened by the resources of the surgeon's art. These truths, therefore, establish the proposition that it is *not* possible for a child to be born alive without killing or positively endangering the life of the mother."

Dr. Robert P. Harris.

"It is never without great risk to the mother, to remove a living or viable foetus, which is not in the cavity of her uterus. It has been done, but the ultimate recoveries have been very rare."

Dr. J. E. Kelly.

"I should doubt the utility of considering any of the fore-mentioned forms of pregnancy as being compatible with the production of a living child at full term, as although not logically impossible it cannot be expected."

Many things that the chances of saving both mother and child are insignificant.

Dr. R. B. Maury.

"In none."

Dr. Mordecai Price.

"In neither."

Dr. T. A. Ashby.

"In none without grave danger to life."

Dr. J. F. Moran.

"None; all operations terminating abnormal pregnancies are fraught with danger."

Dr. W. T. Lusk.

"I dislike as much as you do anything that savors of life destruction. But in my answers, I am obliged to take things as they are, and not as I would wish them. The facts are these: fortunately only a small percentage survive the unfavorable conditions in which the ovum is placed. In all cases where the ovum does not perish, the dangers to the mother are progressive with the advance of gestation. The chances of saving the child are insignificant. The ethics must be deduced from these data."

Dr. Jos. Taber Johnson.

Others, without being sanguine, are somewhat more hopeful. The most favorable form is the abdominal one. Next come interstitial, intra-ligamentous, ovarian pregnancies.

“In the above named types the child cannot be ‘produced alive’ except by a surgical operation, which would necessarily *endanger* the mother’s life, but with a strong probability of her recovery.”

Dr. Henry D. Fry.

“In none can it be done without endangering her life; presuming that ‘abnormal’<sup>1</sup> refers to ectopic pregnancy. The danger, however, by artificial passage is small compared to that of non-interference. The intra-ligamentous and abdominal forms are about the only ones that offer a chance to save the child.”

Dr. Wm. Goodell.

“Possibly in the interstitial and in the intra-ligamentous variety the natural passages might occasionally be used. But even then in almost every case a preliminary incision would have to be made, thereby endangering the life of the mother. All other cases would demand a dangerous operation.”

Dr. B. F. Baer.

“Intra-ligamentous and so-called abdominal.”

Dr. I. S. Stone.

“Abdominal pregnancy, or broad ligament pregnancy at term.”

Dr. C. E. Ristine..

“Abdominal most favorable for life of child together with that of the mother.”

Dr. Jas. Weir Heddens.

“Ovarian, intra-ligamentous, abdominal.”

Dr. C. Henri Leonard.

“Probably interstitial—doubtful the others.”

Thos. Addis Emmet.

As a rule an operation is indispensable. However, in supposed tubal and interstitial cases, delivery the way of the uterus and vagina has occurred.

“It is impossible with certainty to produce the child alive in any form of abnormal pregnancy without endangering the life of the mother. Cases of supposed tubal pregnancy

<sup>1</sup> *Abnormal* is doubtless too vague a word, but authors do not quite agree in their lists of *ectopic* pregnancies.—C.



have been put on record where gestation had gone to full term, and delivery had taken place through the efforts of nature by way of the uterus and vagina. But these cases were in all probability ones of mistaken diagnosis, so far at least in the fact that the horn of the uterus was also included in the seat of pregnancy. Cases so termed of abdominal pregnancy have gone to full term, when, by the aid of the surgeon, both child and mother have been saved. In other forms of abnormal pregnancy, I believe the only safety to the mother consists in an early operation, by which the life of the foetus must be lost; without an operation, as a rule, both must die."

Dr. J. M. Emmert.

"In answer to your first question, I know of but one form of pregnancy that strictly comes under this head, that is, interstitial pregnancy, where the development of the ovum so dilates the tubes, that it is gradually pushed into the uterine cavity, making it a normal pregnancy. I know of no other where the life of the mother does not become endangered."

Dr. Wm. H. Parish.

"Possibly *per vias naturales* when child is in uterine portion of tube. In all other conditions, the child being alive, it may be produced alive by coeliotomy, with very little risk to the mother in early pregnancy, this risk increasing with advancing pregnancy."

Dr. E. C. Dudley.

"The child may sometimes be delivered at term through the natural passages when the pregnancy was tubal, if the child was located close to the horn of the uterus.

"In any other uterine pregnancy the foetus, having reached a viable age, may occasionally be produced alive, but always with great danger to the mother.

"The danger to the mother is also very great, though perhaps not always so great when the dead child is produced."

[Dr. Dudley says: "The great point in question is the mother's life and health. The bodily welfare of the child can hardly involve a question (See answer to question VI).

Its spiritual welfare would appear important or unimportant, according to the theological views of the person who has the matter under consideration. For myself, I would not permit the question of spiritual welfare of the child to endanger the mother's life." ]<sup>1</sup>

Dr. T. Gaillard Thomas.

Yet the rule "If the pregnancy be ectopic, the child cannot be produced remains true, alive *by any* NATURAL PASSAGE. All operations for the purpose endanger the mother." *that, generally speaking, a delivery per vias naturales*

Dr. A. A. Henske.

*s impossible, and that all operations are dangerous to the mother.* "In none of the abnormal pregnancies mentioned can the child be produced through the natural passages, but has to be produced through an artificial one. Every operation for that purpose is dangerous to the mother, although not necessarily fatal."

Dr. Charles P. Noble.

"(a) In none by natural means. (b) In abdominal and in intra-ligamentous pregnancies living children have been delivered and the mother has recovered by means of abdominal section. The operation is a very grave one but a necessity."

Dr. P. Gourdin De Saussure.

"None.—The mother's life is *positively endangered* under all circumstances in all of these cases."

Dr. L. E. Neale.

"There is no surgical procedure which may not endanger the life of the mother in these cases."

Dr. George H. Rohé.

"I assume (without expressing a positive opinion) that the development of the foetus can proceed to term in all forms of ectopic pregnancy. It is considered by authorities as doubtful whether this can occur in the tubal form without rupture of the tube at some period. However, in either event, the child, having arrived at a viable period, may be extracted

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Robie Woods of New York mentioned to the compiler a case in which the pregnancy was at first *tubal*, and afterwards *interstitial*; the embryo ultimately reached the womb, but it was extremely small and had died *in transitu*.—C.

alive through an artificial way by the surgeon, without necessarily killing the mother. It is evident, however, that an operation such as would be necessary to accomplish the delivery would to a considerable degree endanger the mother's life. The degree of this danger depends upon many *momenta*, chief among which are perhaps the vital condition and surroundings of the mother, and the skill and care of the physician."

Dr. Barton Cooke Hirst.

"In any case of abnormal or advanced tubal gestation with a viable child an operation to remove the child alive is justifiable. It is, however, unavoidably dangerous to the mother even with improved modern technique."

Dr. Michael O'Hara.

"During the first three months there is very little possibility. From the 3rd to 6th month more possibility—after sixth month probable. In early months the danger from operation to mother is slight; in later periods danger increases with the growth of the child."

Dr. Howard A. Kelly.

"(a) Regarding the word 'abnormal' in this question as synonymous with ectopic, the child can sometimes be delivered *per vias naturales* in cases of interstitial pregnancy. Dr. Howard Kelly sums the evidence

(b) It is also possible in rare cases of extra-uterine pregnancy, in which the child has developed in an unruptured tube, to remove the sac with the living child by abdominal section.

(c) It is also possible in rare instances in extra-uterine pregnancy, in which the sac has ruptured and the child escaped into the abdominal cavity and has survived this accident, to deliver a living child and at the same time to remove the whole sac.

In (b), and (c), there is danger to the maternal life."

## SECOND QUESTION.

*During pregnancy, at what time and by what means can a differential diagnosis be made between INTRA and EXTRA-UTERINE pregnancy, and between normal gestation and pelvic or other tumor?*

Dr. W. T. Lusk.

The diagnosis is very difficult; but, as the ovum or the foetus is usually dead before it is discovered, the problem seems to be a clinical.

“Extra-uterine pregnancy is of common occurrence; fortunately the early death of the foetus from natural causes makes it usually a matter of minor moment. The frequent discovery of the dead ovum in a tube when there has been no suspicion of pregnancy shows the difficulty of the diagnosis.”

Dr. Jos. Taber Johnson.

“A diagnosis can only be made by most thorough, careful and repeated examinations by an expert; and even then, so many errors have been made, in the early months, that some of our most renowned and skillful operators have declared a certain diagnosis impossible.”

Dr. T. J. McGillicuddy.

“It is often impossible to make an absolutely certain diagnosis.”

Dr. Robert P. Harris.

“There is no fixed period. Mistakes have been made at all periods, even by very capable men, as are known to me personally. If the uterus is abnormal, error may readily be made, as I have twice seen.”

Dr. J. P. Chesney.

An exploratory section is often the only practicable means of diagnosing with certainty.

“By laparotomy only: and even with the abdominal section made, and the pelvic and abdominal contents examined as thoroughly as scientific acumen is capable of doing, yet *doubt* and *mistake* must enter largely into the problem.”

Dr. George H. Rohé.

“In some cases this is comparatively easy and can be readily made at any time after the third month. In others, and these constitute the vast majority, it is extremely difficult and the differential diagnosis cannot be made at all without an abdominal section. As a general rule, it may be said that a diagnosis before operation is always open to

grave doubt. Indeed it is sometimes necessary to resort to a microscopic examination of the specimen after removal before a positive opinion can be given."

Dr. J. F. Moran.

"Very difficult to diagnose before primary rupture; no positive sign to differentiate ectopic pregnancy from tubal occlusion or from other causes. After primary rupture, diagnosis is comparatively certain."

Dr. Michael O'Hara.

"At any time by skilled physical examinations. Differential diagnosis is more difficult in the early than at the later periods."

Yet it is often possible and should be attempted before resorting to exploratory laparotomy.

Dr. Mordecai Price.

"Should be made in all."

Dr. Barton Cooke Hirst.

"In almost all cases of advanced gestation the differential diagnosis can be made. In early cases it is not always possible unless conditions be favorable."

Dr. William H. Parish.

"The diagnosis of extra-uterine pregnancy is only a probable one in early months. The diagnosis is more easily made and becomes certain later in pregnancy."

Dr. B. F. Baer.

"The *absolute* diagnosis is difficult, but where uncomplicated extra-uterine pregnancy exists a strong presumptive diagnosis may be made at six weeks. A working diagnosis can be made often at four weeks."

A working diagnosis may sometimes be made after four weeks, two months, three months, or four months.

Dr. T. G. Thomas.

"After the second month, diagnosis is perfectly possible; to tell the methods would be too long."

Dr. Matthew D. Mann.

"A diagnosis can sometimes, not always, be made without operation, simply by examination at a very early stage, as in the second month of gestation. In most cases the diagnosis can only be made with certainty by laparotomy."

Dr. T. A. Ashby.

"After the second month a probable diagnosis may be made by history of symptoms and physical examination of

tumor. Positive diagnosis not possible until foetus is viable unless the abdomen is opened."

Dr. C. Henri Leonard.

"Usually about third month."

Dr. Joseph Price.

"After the third month, by exclusion."

Dr. Henry D. Fry.

"In some cases, different at all periods. In the majority a differential diagnosis can be made at third month. In others it will be necessary to open the abdomen before positive diagnosis can be arrived at."

Dr. C. E. Ristine.

"Not always positively until after the third month of gestation. Internal and external auscultation—bi-manual palpitation. The sound should not be used. Uterus does not grow *pari passu* with the ectopic growth."

Dr. Henry Schwarz.

"A positive diagnosis can usually not be made until the end of the fourth month, unless some accident happens, as for instance a rupture of the sac in tubal pregnancy."

Dr. P. Gourdin De Saussure.

"Intra-uterine pregnancy can be positively diagnosed at fourth month, the extra-uterine is diagnosed when you have ascertained pregnancy, but not in the uterus. As to the differential diagnosis—why a volume can be written on it.

Dr. L. E. Neale.

"There is no time-limit fixed; it varies with the ability, skill and experience of the examiner and the peculiarities of the case."

Dr. J. E. Kelly.

"No rule can be formulated, as the cases vary so materially and as so many instances of mistaken diagnosis have been published and are otherwise known. Laparotomy is the only conclusive test; the others are either useless or dangerous or both.

Dr. J. M. Emmert.

"This is a question of education entirely. The expert may and often does diagnose ectopic pregnancy within six

weeks of conception. The first six to eight weeks the subjective symptoms of ectopic and normal pregnancies are similar. About this time stretching of the tissues by the growing ovum gives pain, or produces a rupture, which causes a train of symptoms peculiar to shock or hemorrhage. The diagnosis must be made by these symptoms, and the touch or physical examination. To enter into the differential diagnosis would necessarily be very lengthy. Suffice it to say that the feel of an ectopic pregnancy is that of a boggy mass rather than that of a well defined tumor."

Dr. E. E. Montgomery.

"A diagnosis may be made inferentially, often early in the pregnancy; as early as the second month, when the patient supposes herself to be pregnant, has had a sudden violent pain in the abdomen, symptoms of collapse, and there has subsequently been discovered a mass situated in one or the other broad ligament, which is indicated by the occurrence of rupture of the ectopic sac. The further pregnancy progresses from this period, the more likely are we to be able to differentiate its character. A woman who has a mass situated on one side of the pelvis, in whom there is more or less constant bloody uterine discharge; or one in whom there is a mass increasing in size, in which latter can be distinguished foetal heart sounds and foetal movements, while the uterus is found pushed to one side and but little, if any, enlarged, (is pregnant *extra uterum*)."

Dr. Howard A. Kelly.

"(a) The differential diagnosis between intra and extra-uterine pregnancy can usually be made from the sixth week

1 Moralists must bear in mind that *all ruptures* are *very* dangerous, and that unless the surgeon arrives in time, *many ruptures* are *necessarily* fatal. The only way to save both mother and child is to use the knife, reach the bleeding vessel and ligate it. In tubal pregnancy, there are two ruptures (the first is not fatal); a *primary* one, when the foetus forces its way out of the tube, and a *secondary* one, when it strives to reach the exterior world through the tissues of the mother. Nature sometimes plugs, with a clot, the opening left by the former; without the timely help of the surgeon the latter is infallibly fatal both to the mother and to the child.—C

up to the end of pregnancy. It is more easily made from the tenth to the twelfth week on.

“(b) The means of making the diagnosis are by first recognizing the signs of pregnancy, such as cessation of menstruation, nausea, pain in breasts, etc.; second, by careful bi-manual examination establishing the fact that the uterus is either not at all or is but moderately enlarged, while there exists a tumor in one of its cornua; third, by the passage of a decidual cast from the uterus; fourth, by the rupture of the sac producing signs of internal hemorrhage.

“Note that the fourth, and usually the third sign, is not available for making a diagnosis while the foetus is living.”

Dr. E. C. Dudley.

“This question is difficult to answer and the answer would require several pages of writing. The diagnosis is often very difficult, sometimes impossible without exploratory incision.”

Dr. Charles P. Noble.

“(a) Often at second month by bi-manual examination under anaesthesia.

(b) Usually intra-uterine pregnancy can be excluded.

(c) It is often impossible to differentiate extra-uterine pregnancy and pelvic tumor.”

Dr. William Goodell.

A differential diagnosis can rarely be made positively, except by means of an exploratory section, unless the foetal heart or the foetal ruffle can be recognized.

“A differential diagnosis can rarely be made positively at any stage of extra-uterine pregnancy. It is arrived at more by inference than by exclusion. In a question of *intra* or of *extra-uterine* pregnancy, the contra-indication to the use of the uterine sound prevents certainty of diagnosis. The sound is not used because, if the pregnancy were a natural one, an abortion would follow its insertion.”

Dr. L. H. Dunning.

“It is very difficult at any time to diagnose ectopic gestation. When rupture takes place the symptoms are usually sufficient to enable one to make the diagnosis. After the fifth month of pregnancy the foetal heart-beats and motion of the child will enable one to diagnose pregnancy. The diffi-



culty is to determine positively that it is extra-uterine ; sometimes the uterus can be outlined independent of the tumor, then diagnosis can be made."

Dr. A. A. Henske.

"Between intra and extra-uterine pregnancy at any time. —Between abnormal gestation and pelvic or other tumor the differential diagnosis is difficult at any time, except so far advanced that you can feel parts of the child through the abdomen."

Dr. John F. Roderer.

"Extra-uterine pregnancy according to Dr. Lawson Tait, probably one of the greatest living authorities on this subject, is primarily tubal. (He does not admit the possibility of an ovarian pregnancy.)<sup>1</sup> The foetus remains in the tube until about the fourteenth week when rupture takes place. The rupture of the tube is in one of two directions: first, into the cavity of the peritoneum, which is fatal immediately by hemorrhage, or later by rupture of the sac and peritonitis; secondly, into the folds of the broad ligament. The second variety does not result in immediate death. In that form the foetus may develop and be removed when it is viable. It may also die and begin to suppurate and the suppurating mass may be discharged through the bladder, vagina or rectum. It may also rupture again through the wall of the broad ligament and become what is called an abdominal

1 In his reply to the Editor of the REVIEW, Dr. Lawson Tait, indicates that he considers the distinction of "Ovarian and Tubo-abdominal types of ectopic pregnancies as inadmissible." Most probably a tubo-abdominal pregnancy is nothing but a tubal pregnancy, which, after primary rupture, has become an abdominal gestation; but in strictly physiological questions, moralists are not bound to take sides. With regard to ovarian pregnancy, whether it be possible or not, its name is current in literature, and could not well be suppressed. In connection with these difficult problems the following passage of a comparatively recent work may prove of interest;

"The relative frequency of these (ectopic pregnancies) we find, by taking the average of a large number of cases, to be about 52 per cent. Abdominal; 42 per cent. Tubal; 6 per cent. Ovarian." (Cazeaux and Tarnier—Theory and Practice of Obstetrics, Appendix by Paul Munde, p. 1165, Philadelphia, 1889.)

pregnancy. That rupture may result in immediate death from hemorrhage, or the foetus may go on to full term in a very small number of cases.

The foetus may develop in that part of the tube which is connected with the uterus. That is sometimes called tubo-uterine or interstitial pregnancy. In this form the rupture takes place about the fifth month and is almost always fatal. The rupture may take place into the uterus and then the foetus will be discharged by the uterus.

The diagnosis of extra-uterine pregnancy resolves itself into two parts: first, before rupture of the tube, and secondly, after rupture of the tube.

The diagnosis before rupture of the tube is difficult to make. In nearly all of the cases the existence of extra-uterine pregnancy is not even suspected until rupture takes place. Rarely is the physician called in until rupture has occurred. In some cases when the physician for some reason or other is called in and makes an examination and perhaps suspects extra-uterine pregnancy, he cannot make a positive diagnosis. He finds on examination that the uterus is enlarged and that there is also a painful mass occupying the place of one of the tubes; now, that womb may have in it a foetus, and the mass may be a disease of tube or ovary. Or that mass may be an extra-uterine pregnancy, and the enlargement of the womb may be the increase in size which always takes place in ectopic pregnancy. The physician, although he knows from the rational signs that there is pregnancy in some form or other, cannot with certainty decide between both.

The diagnosis after rupture of the tube can more easily be made, and particularly after quickening has taken place.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above is, that the diagnosis between intra and extra-uterine pregnancy cannot be made with certainty before rupture, nor can it be determined exactly whether an enlargement of the tube is either an ectopic pregnancy or some form of tumor."

Dr. R. B. Maury.

"Prior to rupture, in the early months, a diagnosis between

abnormal gestation and pelvic tumor cannot be made with certainty. In the later months, when pregnancy is certain, its extra-uterine character may be determined by demonstrating that the uterine cavity is empty ; and by the absence of the uterine souffle."

Dr. James Weir Heddens.

"(1) About or between the 2d and 3d months, by ballottement and bi-manual examination. (2) Not until you can hear the foetal heart, usually between the 6th and 7th month."

Dr. T. A. Emmet.

"There can be no absolute certainty as to the existence of pregnancy in any case until the pulsation of the foetal heart can be detected ; a gradual increase in the size of the uterus can be easily recognized, and with other symptoms, pregnancy may be supposed ; but any attempt made to determine the point of investigation as to the condition within the uterus will be likely to cause abortion, should pregnancy exist. A diagnosis is difficult in all cases of abnormal pregnancy, but an expert can, within a reasonable degree of certainty, arrive at a knowledge of the existing condition between the 2d and 3d month."

Usually, no absolute certainty is attainable before the pulsation of the foetal heart can be detected.

### THIRD QUESTION.

*Before such a diagnosis can be made, is it sometimes imperative to destroy or remove the growth in order to save the mother ?*

"Yes ; most certainly."

Dr. B. F. Baer,  
 Dr. E. C. Dudley,  
 Dr. L. H. Dunning,  
 Dr. J. M. Emmert,  
 Dr. H. D. Fry,  
 Dr. James Weir Heddens,  
 Dr. A. A. Henske,  
 Dr. R. B. Maury,  
 Dr. L. E. Neale,  
 Dr. M. O'Hara,  
 Dr. Mordecai Price.

An overwhelming majority declares that it is often necessary to do so before a certain diagnosis can be made.

Dr. T. G. Thomas.<sup>1</sup>

“Yes. Foetal life should be destroyed by electricity up to the end of 3d month.”

Dr. Wm. Goodell.

“It is usually imperative to remove the growth before such a diagnosis can be made positively.”

Dr. Joseph Price.

“Yes. Growth of any character is a constant menace to the patient's life.”

Dr. Jos. Taber Johnson.

“Yes ; especially when the tube has ruptured, which it usually does before the end of the third month.”

Dr. I. S. Stone.

“The diagnosis being difficult, the symptoms of grave illness often demand surgical treatment in the early stages of ectopic gestation, hence an affirmative answer to this question.”

Dr. T. A. Ashby.

“Yes. In my judgment as soon as the surgeon has positive assurance of an ectopic pregnancy he should open the abdomen and remove the foetal sac. He should operate before a positive diagnosis is reached if the physical condition of the tumor and symptoms of the mother warrant interference. No woman is safe with a growing foetal tumor in her abdomen. Interference may be postponed until the end of term of gestation, if the mother does well during pregnancy.”

Dr. J. E. Kelly.

“The necessity of checking or removing an abdominal tumor of an operable nature, renders the early application

<sup>1</sup> Medically, we have nothing whatever to say in opposition to such an authority as Dr. Thomas ; ethically, we may be allowed to raise the following objection : Either the growth contains a foetus, or it does not ; if it does, then electricity helps the mother *solely* by destroying the foetus ; if it does not, then electricity will hardly destroy the growth. However, if the necessity is absolutely imperative, and if we take the standpoint that the foetus is an *unconscious*, but *unjust* aggressor, the objection is not unanswerable.—C.

of some treatment almost imperative. Any of the recognized forms of treatment would most decidedly jeopardize the life of the mother in proportion to the duration of the postponement."

Dr. J. Portman Chesney.

"Destroying the vitality of the foetus or embryo, as in tubal pregnancy for example, only minifies but does not eradicate the danger to the mother. This is shown to be so in reply to question No. 1."

Dr. Howard A. Kelly.

"It is imperative to remove the growth at the earliest practicable moment after it is discovered. It is not good surgery to attempt to destroy the growth by any outward applications or by treatment through the vagina, such as puncture or injections."

Dr. E. E. Montgomery.

"Not unfrequently before the abnormal condition is suspected, our patient may be placed in peril of her life by rupture of the tubal sac and the consequent hemorrhage. In such cases the mother is afforded the greatest security of life by immediate surgical interference. With a bleeding vessel inside of the abdomen, its ligation is as certainly demanded as would be the ligation of a large vessel bleeding externally."

Dr. George H. Rohé.

"I should answer this question without hesitation in the affirmative, merely qualifying the question by eliminating the word 'destroy.' It is the removal of the growth that is demanded by sound surgical principles."

It is the removal, not the destruction of the growth which is required.

Dr. P. Gourdin de Saussure.

"A positive diagnosis is not always possible before the fourth month, yet sometimes operative interference is demanded on account of the mother long before. In other words: Yes; one operates to save the mother and makes a diagnosis."

Dr. I. S. Stone.

"Diagnosis always difficult. Symptoms only indicate an abnormal location—these symptoms of an erratic location

lead to examination and possible diagnosis. Diagnosis usually made with more certainty after fourth month."

Dr. Robert P. Harris.

"Under suspicious circumstances, an exploratory coeliotomy may be justifiable, to be followed by exsection if found to be practicable."

Dr. Charles P. Noble.

"Yes, if hemorrhage occurs."

Dr. Jno. F. Moran.

"It is not always possible to diagnose nature of trouble before operation. If it should be recognized as ectopic gestation before primary rupture, the growth should be removed without delay."

Dr. Matthew D. Mann.

"Teachers are divided regarding this question. Some maintain that it should be destroyed by electricity, etc., as soon as discovered. Others believe in immediate operation. None advise, so far as I know, to let it alone when extra-uterine pregnancy is discovered at an early date. The risks to the mother, if left alone, are considered too great. If rupture of the sac occurs with internal hemorrhage, early operation is generally imperative."

Dr. Barton Cooke Hirst.

"For one, I should always remove an extra-uterine pregnancy as early as possible, not waiting for a positive diagnosis, but operating on well founded suspicion."

Dr. C. Henri Leonard.

"Sometimes. I regard interstitial variety as least likely to make this imperative."

Dr. C. E. Ristine.

"Seldom, but I recognize that it may require immediate operation."

Dr. T. J. McGillicuddy,

Dr. Henry Schwarz.

"Never imperative before a probable diagnosis can be made."

Dr. John F. Roderer.

"There are a variety of diseases, or growths of the tubes

or ovaries, the existence of which can be made out by the educated physician, but the nature of which cannot be determined until after operation. As one authority in treating of extra-uterine cysts aptly remarks: 'I open the abdomen and make out the condition.' That is the method by which abnormal growths in a great number of instances are diagnosed.

"Now as the growth discovered by the physician may be a pyo-salpinx, or extra-uterine pregnancy, particularly the latter, if there be an enlargement of the womb, and if there be present other rational signs of pregnancy, the physician will advise immediate operation.

"The Catholic physician will be very much puzzled how to act in a case which he knows to be an extra-uterine pregnancy (before rupture). If he leaves it alone he knows that the woman and child may probably die at the time of rupture. If he removes the tube he will kill the child. What should be done in this dilemma, I leave to the moralist to decide."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. T. A. Emmet.

"The sac containing the product of pregnancy is almost certain to rupture after the third month, and sometimes, even before that period, the surgeon is obliged to operate under the most urgent circumstances for the removal of the whole growth, to save the mother who is then sinking rapidly from internal hemorrhage as a consequence of rupture. Very frequently under these circumstances, death occurs before assistance can be rendered by the surgeon. Rupture frequently takes place before the pregnancy has been expected, or the surgeon is called upon to make a diagnosis, as he is called in haste to operate with no certain knowledge of the condition, beyond an existing state of shock or collapse attributed to internal hemorrhage."

Drs. Emmet and Lusk show why interference is often imperative.

1 If the danger is imminent, perform the abdominal section, open the cyst, baptize the child, ligate the mother's bleeding vessels, take what care you can of the baby, or rather intrust it to some one who knows well what to do, attend to the mother, and leave the rest to God. The indorsement of Lehmkuhl gives us more confidence than we had before.—C.

Dr. W. T. Lusk.

“Usually the ovum dies and hemorrhage takes place and haematocele results, or, if the abdominal orifice of the tube is closed, a haematoma in the tube is produced. In these cases the patient recovers, later the tube containing the dead ovum may be removed by the surgeon. If the tube ruptures into the peritoneal cavity, with the growth of the ovum an operation is usually imperative.”

---

FOURTH QUESTION.

*Does electricity destroy the life of the foetus or the vitality of the growth as certainly as the knife of the surgeon, and with as much safety to the mother? Suppose that the foetus has been destroyed by electricity, say, at the third month of tubal pregnancy, is the mother in as safe a condition as though the foetus had been removed by the surgeon?*

Electricity is  
t as safe as  
e knife,  
ther as a  
rowth-de-  
oyer or as  
means to  
ve the  
other.

To your first question I answer *No*.

To your second question I answer *No*.

Dr. B. F. Baer.

Dr. E. C. Dudley.

Dr. Jas. Weir Heddens.

Dr. Barton Cooke Hirst.

Dr. J. F. Moran.

Dr. L. E. Neale.

Dr. Michael O'Hara.

Dr. William H. Parish.

Dr. Joseph Price.

Dr. Mordecai Price.

Dr. Henry Schwarz.

Dr. I. S. Stone.

Dr. Howard A. Kelly.

“(a) Electricity is less certain and less safe than the knife of the surgeon.



“(b) If the foetus has been destroyed by electricity, say at the third month of tubal pregnancy, the mother is not in as safe a condition as though the foetus had been removed by the surgeon.”

Dr. J. M. Emmert.

“No, it does not; the placenta may go on growing after the foetus is destroyed.

“Latter part of the question decidedly No.”

Dr. Robert P. Harris.

“1. No. It may for a time be safer to the mother.

“2. No. The dead foetus is a foreign body, and may in time give much trouble, and even death.”

Dr. T. A. Ashby.

“No. I would not trust electricity. I prefer to open the abdomen and remove the growth.”

Dr. Win. Goodell.

“Electricity does not compare with the knife either in efficiency or in safety; should the foetus be destroyed by electricity, the mother is not left in so safe a condition as when the gestation sac has been removed.”

Dr. Charles P. Noble.

“(a) No. Electricity has been proven unreliable as a foeticide.

“(b) The mother is not so safe. She carries a foreign body—the dead ovum—which may cause inflammation, suppuration, etc.”

Dr. J. E. Kelly.

“Electricity of such power as can be applied with absolute safety to the mother cannot be regarded as being certainly fatal to the ovum, while the knife is most unerring. On the other hand, if the mother should survive the abdominal section she certainly would be more advantageously circumstanced than if the dead foetus, liable to so many changes, were permitted to remain within her body.”

Dr. E. E. Montgomery.

“Electricity is very uncertain. In a number of cases that have been reported of its favorable action, there is no question but what it has an influence and may be able to arrest

foetal life. That it does not do so, however, in every case, has been just as certainly demonstrated, although patients have been subjected to violent applications—applications of such a character as to have a destructive influence on the intervening tissues. Even though the foetus has been destroyed at the third month of tubal pregnancy, the condition of the mother is not a safe one, as she has a foreign mass within the abdomen which demands the exercise of healthy organs and tissues to promote either its being encysted or its ultimate disintegration and absorption. Many cases of pus collections in the pelvis are directly traceable to the influence of previous ectopic gestations, and the life of the patient is in peril so long as such a collection remains.”

Dr. P. Gourdin De Saussure.

“The surgeon’s knife is the mother’s safety. A dead or alive foetus in a tube, abdomen, or between the broad ligament, is always a menace to the mother.”

Dr. L. H. Dunning.

“1. Yes (as sure as a growth destroyer).

“2. No (does not leave the mother in as safe a condition).”

Dr. C. E. Ristine.

“To the first part of question fourth I answer no; but second—if accomplished—with more safety to the mother.

“To second part of question fourth—Statistically the mother is safer in the hands of an experienced electrician than in the hands of our occasional surgeon; but not so safe as under the gynecic surgeon.”

Dr. T. G. Thomas.

The danger to the mother is not great. “Not quite (as sure as a growth destroyer). But the danger from foeticide by electricity is not great (for the mother).”

Dr. R. B. Maury.

Electricity may succeed, but sometimes fails. The mother is not safe when the child is dead. “It may destroy the life of the foetus with more safety than the knife. In some well-known cases very strong currents have failed to destroy the life. If the foetus were destroyed by electricity at third month, the mother is by no means safe.”

Dr. C. Henri Leonard.

“In my own family I should recommend the electric current first; that failing, the knife.

Would tr  
electricity first

“Yes, conditionally.”

Dr. T. A. Emmet.

“The use of electricity is frequently as certain as the use of the knife. Within my personal experience I have knowledge of a number of cases of abnormal pregnancy where electricity has been used to destroy the life of the foetus, and with no detriment to the life of the mother afterwards, but a portion of the foetus cannot be absorbed and, notwithstanding, it becomes encysted, it must always remain a foreign body, and liable to some extent to cause trouble. With the advance that has been made in abdominal surgery, I would now urge, if free to advise, an early operation, made in the interest of the mother and with the removal of the whole mass.”

Electricit  
more or les  
sustained.

Dr. John F. Roderer.

“The foetus can be destroyed by electrolytic action but not with entire safety to the mother. Should the foetus be killed it still leaves behind it, in the tube, a foreign growth. The tube may be ruptured sooner than it would be if the growth of the foetus were not interfered with. While the growth remains, the woman is never safe. As the growth has to be removed at some time, it is preferable to do so with the knife before rupture (if allowed on moral grounds).”<sup>1</sup>

Dr. A. A. Henske.

“Electricity skillfully applied will destroy the life of the foetus as certain as the surgeon’s knife, but *not* the vitality of the *tumor*. The mother will *not* be in a safe condition at all when it has been destroyed by electricity. If the removal by the surgeon has been successful, the mother will be absolutely safe.”

Dr. George Rohé.

“I believe electricity is competent to destroy the vitality of the foetus with comparative safety to the mother, but it is

<sup>1</sup> It is allowed when the tube is diseased and endangers the whole body.—C.

not as certain as removal by means of the surgeon's knife. This latter probably adds to the immediate danger of the mother, but should she recover, her subsequent life would doubtless be more free from dangerous *sequelae*. The retention of a dead or semi-organic mass of foreign tissue, if the expression be allowable, is a potential source of danger to which the woman should not be subjected."

Dr. J. P. Chesney.

"Not so *surely* as the knife; more safely to the mother. . . . If the woman is beforehand allowed to choose between the knife and electricity she is wise if she select the latter. She would still be in *some* danger, though the embryo be dead."

Dr. Henry D. Fry.

"1. No.

"2. No.—But electricity is useful in a certain class of cases seen early, and in the vast majority the destroyed foetus causes no subsequent trouble."

Dr. T. J. McGillicuddy.

"The knife of the surgeon is preferable, but seldom necessary."

Dr. Jos. Taber Johnson.

Objects to "To the first part of this question I should answer em-  
electricity. phatically *no*. To the second part I should say also no—  
Diagnosis though some cases have apparently done well—but unless  
without opera- proved by an operation there is always doubt as to the  
tion is not abso- diagnosis."<sup>1</sup>  
lutely certain.

Dr. Matthew D. Mann.

Believes "Again opinion is divided. I believe electricity to be  
electricity to be both safe and safe and sure in the early months before rupture. The knife  
both safe and sure before is absolutely sure and, in the hands of experts, very safe. A  
rupture. dead foetus inside the abdomen very possibly causes trouble  
later. If removed, that is the end of it. The risks of opera-  
ation are greater than of electricity."

1. The ethical objection to electricity is that it takes away any chance to save the child, and yet does not by any means secure the life of the mother. In ectopic pregnancies, it has no distinct remedial power.—C.

Dr. W. T. Lusk.

“ If the rupture occurs between the folds of the broad ligament, and the life of the foetus is maintained, electricity may be employed. These cases are rare, but formerly were the only ones recognized. It is best, even in these cases, to operate; but electricity in the early months is permissible, where the appliances, nursing and trained assistance needed for successful laparotomy, are absent.”

Thinks best to operate but requires appliance nursing and trained assistance.

---

FIFTH QUESTION.

*Should laparotomy reveal the fact that the growth contains a real foetus, is it advisable to puncture the membranes, remove the growth entirely, or is it preferable to use the incandescent knife to open the membranes so as to give the foetus a chance to live if but a few moments?*

Dr. W. T. Lusk.

“ The question of puncture or removal of the entire growth must be left to the operator. For instance, in my last case I endeavored to remove the sac entire, but before I had done so, accidental rupture occurred. In either case, the child is likely to be born alive, if living at the outset.”

The operation is often guided by circumstances.

Dr. A. A. Henske.

“ In extra-uterine pregnancy it is proper to remove foetus, membranes and all, without puncturing the membranes. Immediately after removal of the sac, (the membrane) should be opened for the purpose mentioned in question.”

Yet the removal of the foetus is best.

Dr. J. F. Moran.

“ Removal of foetus by knife is preferable to puncture as the patient is less exposed to septicaemia, and the chances of the child being removed alive are much greater.”

Dr. Lawson Tait, (Op. cit., p. 544.)

“ Puncturing the ovum sac with needles, medicated or galvanic, is an immoral and dangerous proceeding which ought to have professional condemnation. Parry is of opinion that all measures that necessitate wounding the

Puncturing direct killing

cyst, without removing the child, are not without danger to the woman, and that the question to determine is whether the risks of such a therapeutic measure, though they may be grave, may not be less than those which follow when the *accident is abandoned to nature* . . . No acupuncture, simple or medicated, and no electrolytic charlatany will save a woman who has a vessel bleeding into the peritoneal cavity. If the child survives that rupture, it has a legal and a moral right to its life, and ought not to be deliberately killed.’

Dr. T. G. Thomas.

“The incandescent knife is *ancient history*. A live foetus may be produced by surgery after the fifth or sixth month though not viable so early.”<sup>1</sup>

Dr. R. B. Maury.

“There is no advantage in using the incandescent knife : the growth had better be removed entirely if possible.”

Dr. Henry D. Fry.

“The incandescent knife would offer no advantages.”

Dr. I. S. Stone.

“The ‘incandescent knife’ offers no advantages over the usual method of the surgeon, viz., quick removal as best for mother and child.”

Dr. Wm. Goodell.

“The cold knife would, in my opinion, give a better chance for the foetus to live a few moments, because the delivery could be effected more rapidly.”

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Thomas is one of those who have used the incandescent knife with great success, yet, after trial, he has discarded it for the cold knife just as he has discarded laparo-elytrotomy for the Cæsarean section. The electric knife “has been weighed in the balance, and (by comparison) found wanting.” Dr. Thomas says this of laparo-elytrotomy as compared to the Cæsarean section, but it applies equally to the incandescent *vs.* the cold knife. The only point that concerns the moralist is this : Which method gives a better chance to baptize the child? Dr. Goodell, another great authority, says : “The cold knife.”

Dr. Matthew Mann.

"I can see no object in using the incandescent knife. The membranes can be simply cut open and foetus removed, but I can't see of what use before a viable age. After the 28th week the child must be given every chance."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Robert P. Harris.

"In coeliotomy, where the foetus is alive, it is preferable to remove the entire growth when practicable. If the foetus is viable, it may be saved; if not sufficiently matured, it may live several minutes, or even hours."

Dr. C. E. Ristine.

"Use the incandescent knife only when the foetus has passed the viable period, 7th month; before this period of growth, remove the growth entirely."

Dr. J. E. Kelly.

"The incandescent knife has no established advantage over properly applied cold instruments. It appears that the tenor of this question is moral rather than surgical, as the only benefit to be derived from the prolongation of vitality, for a few moments, would be to afford an opportunity for the administration of the sacrament of Baptism."

Dr. Howard A. Kelly.

"The child has the best chance of living for a brief time if the sac is opened as soon as the abdomen is opened, and the foetus is immediately lifted out. The use of the incandescent knife to open the membranes does not in any way influence the foetus' chances of being born alive, and would be a thoroughly unsurgical procedure."

Dr. William H. Parish.

"In early months the growth is generally removed entire, unless the sac is ruptured accidentally. There is no good

<sup>1</sup> Dr. J. E. Kelly supplies the reason. This question, like the others, is partly surgical and partly ethical. It is its ethical side which makes it of interest to an ecclesiastical review. Roman Catholics, Greeks, Churchmen, Presbyterians, and several other Christian denominations understand the words of St. John, c. III, vv. 3-5, as meaning that baptism is a necessary condition to obtain the beatific vision, *i. e.* the vision of God face to face. The surgeon may not entertain this belief, but he is bound by an *implied contract* to respect the belief of the parents.—C.

The child can be removed by opening the sac, before the removal of the latter.

surgical reason why the child should not be removed by opening the sack before the removal of the latter."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. J. M. Emmert.

"The growth should be entirely removed, if possible. The membranes are opened at once, the foetus removed first, which gives it every opportunity to live, which it will do if pregnancy has attained to seven or more months; if younger, it will sometimes live a few hours."

Dr. Henry Schwarz.

"If the foetus is sufficiently developed to be viable, it is a matter of course that the sac must be opened to give it a chance for its life."

Dr. John F. Roderer.

"If the abdominal section should show that the tube contains a foetus, the best surgical procedure would be to remove with the knife the tube and its contents. If done quickly the foetus may live for a few minutes."

Dr. J. P. Chesney.

"Surely, remove growth entirely, all other conditions admitting it."

Dr. Mordecai Price.

"To your first question I answer, remove the growth entirely."

Dr. P. Gourdin De Saussure.

"Once a diagnosis of extra-uterine pregnancy has been established, the foetus should be removed at once by the knife of the surgeon."

Dr. Joseph Price.

"The growth and foetus should be removed when recognized, in the interest of mother and child."

Dr. J. F. Moran.

"It is not always possible to diagnose nature of trouble before operation. If it should be recognized as ectopic gestation before primary rupture, the growth should be removed without delay."

<sup>1</sup> This would make baptism very easy, chiefly if the cyst could be lifted out of the abdominal cavity, guarded by antiseptic towels, and opened quickly.—C.

Most authorities agree that the whole growth should be removed.



Dr. T. J. McGillicuddy.

“It would be best to divide the membranes and remove the foetus before rupture takes place.”

Dr. James Weir Heddens.

“As a rule, I would remove the growth entirely. There are cases, however, in which the second procedure would be advisable.”

“It is advisable to remove the growth in the early periods totally. In the later periods it is preferable to open the membranes with or without the incandescent knife.”

Dr. George H. Rohé.

“Methods of operating vary with the individual surgeon. Conditions impossible to foresee may require a change in procedure during the progress of the operation. For myself, I should regard the immediate removal of the foetus by means of the knife as promising as much safety to the mother and child as the use of the galvano-cautery. However, experts in the use of the latter might, with justice, prefer this.”

Dr. Jos. Taber Johnson

“After a laparotomy the foetus should be removed—the danger would be less to mother and child. If the child is viable the chief danger to the mother would be in the removal of the placenta and arresting hemorrhage—*now* the rule is not to detach the placenta, but allow it to dry up and absorb or come away in slough.”

Dr. L. H. Dunning.

“It depends upon time of operation. At full term the life of the child should certainly be saved if possible. The danger to the life of the mother is so great that I believe the abdomen should be opened as soon as possible after the discovery of the ectopic pregnancy, and the sac removed.

The very exception I should make to this rule is in cases of interstitial, intra-ligamentous and abdominal pregnancy which are discovered near the full term, and interstitial pregnancy at all times. It is still a mooted question whether in abdominal and intra-ligamentous pregnancies the child should be removed by abdominal section at term, or whether it should be allowed to remain and die, and the placental

circulation cease. 'The latter course I believe to be safer for the mother, but there is a moral question here that is most difficult to decide.'

Dr. B. F. Baer.

"I should prefer the knife as giving the child a better chance to live a few moments."

Dr. E. C. Dudley.

The interest of the mother is paramount, but not exclusive.

"The operation should always be in the interest of the mother, and the individual case would have to decide what plan should be adopted."<sup>1</sup>

Dr. C. Henri Leonard.

"My course would be, pay no attention to the foetus; the *mother* first and *always* should be considered. Foetus at fourth month is not fully formed any way."

Dr. Barton Cooke Hirst.

"If the foetus is not clearly viable I should pay no attention to it, but would operate in any way best for the mother without regard to foetal life."

Dr. T. A. Ashby.

Religious convictions must be respected.

"The answer to this question is a matter of religious belief and training. I would be influenced in my actions entirely by the condition of the mother and the feelings of herself and friends."

Dr. L. E. Neale.

"I should open membranes, perform what religious rights may be necessary in case the child be alive, and remove the child and entire sac if practicable."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Certainly, but the foetus is a human being, and claims also the interest of the surgeon.—C.

<sup>2</sup> In connection with this very important matter, I beg leave to offer the following practical suggestions. Baptism, if very necessary, is also very easy to confer; any person may pour a little pure water on the child and say at the same time: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." But the operator can hardly do even that, the assistant who ligates the vessels, and the one who attends to anaesthesia have their hands full. Let then another person be on hand, a nurse well trained to baptize, or a clergyman, if possible. In the room itself there could be a bowl of water raised to the proper temperature; in

Dr. Charles P. Noble.

“(a) From a medical standpoint it is best to do at once the operation indicated by the conditions present. (b) The desirability of having an immature foetus live a few moments is either a legal or a theological question.”

Dr. E. E. Montgomery.

“Should abdominal section disclose a living, viable foetus, the religious belief of the parents should certainly be respected and the foetus given an opportunity, if possible, to live until the necessary religious functions could be exercised.”

Dr. Lawson Tait, pp. 543.

“Of late years much discussion has turned on various forms of treatment . . . and in the arguments used to support them, an altogether new, and, I venture to think, a very immoral element has been introduced. It is to the effect that if the child is alive the proper thing is to kill it, in the belief that the infant's sacrifice is the mother's safety. I am no theologian and this is hardly the place for a discussion on morals, but I am bound to say that this seems a most mysterious kind of belief, and it would put legitimate practitioners of medicine quite on a level with abortion-mongers and reckless craniotomists. Certainly I will have none of it; the more, that the men who urge it, happen, commonly enough, to be notoriously unfortunate in all their surgical efforts, belonging generally to the hybrid class of obstetric physicians.”

If you cannot save the child, and it dies as a consequence of the care you give to the mother, at least don't kill it directly.

this bowl a vial, containing baptismal water and provided with a glass stopper to exclude disease germs, should be deposited in time to attain the temperature of the water in which it is immersed. Let there be a delicate anti-septic sponge, or a small syringe ready for use (a hypodermic one is not reliable). As soon as the cyst is opened, and the foetus exposed, the rite can be performed; it lasts five seconds by actual count. Direct the water to the head if possible; to any notable portion of the body, if it is not possible to reach the head, without hastening the death of the little waif. Operations are now conducted with such a delicate attention to propriety, that a clergyman can be present without the slightest breach of decorum.—C.

## SIXTH QUESTION.

*When the child is alive, having reached, or nearly reached, its full term (in intra-ligamentous or abdominal pregnancies), can it be saved? Should the physician wait until it is dead in order to avoid certain complications?*

1st. Yes. 2nd. No.

The child  
can be saved.  
The surgeon  
should not  
wait.

Dr. Jas. Weir Heddens,

Dr. L. E. Neale,

Dr. Jos. Price,

Dr. Henry Schwarz.

Dr. T. J. McGillicuddy.

“(a) Yes, it can. (b) It depends upon the skill of the surgeon.”

Dr. T. A. Ashby.

“The child should be saved when possible, if the mother’s life is not jeopardized thereby. It is possible by prompt action to save both mother and child.

I would operate at the very outset of labor pains, or at the presumable end of gestation.”

Dr. B. F. Baer.

“An effort should be made to save the child, but the risk to the mother is probably great.”

Dr. Henry D. Fry.

“Can be saved in a large percentage of cases. Physicians should accept any slight additional risk to mother in order to give the child a chance.

Dr. Wm. Goodell.

“The child then can and should be saved, for I think it would be the duty of the surgeon always to try to save the child under such circumstances, and not to wait until it is dead.”

Dr. T. G. Thomas.

“That question is no longer *sub judice*. In abdominal pregnancy, life has been and surely can be saved, by coeliotomy.”

Dr. Wm. H. Parish.

“I. Yes.

2. The physician should *not* wait until the child is dead, for the mother and child are in very great peril daily."

Dr. C. E. Ristine.

"Yes, sometimes, in answer to the first part of this question. No, there are no complications which to my mind would justify delay until the foetus is dead: provided that was the sole object of delay."

Dr. A. A. Henske.

"There is a possibility for the child to be saved. The physician should never wait until the child is dead."

Dr. Michael O'Hara.

"Yes: the physician should never wait until it is dead, as complications would probably increase to a dangerous degree."

Dr. George H. Rohé.

"In many, certainly in the majority of cases, the child having arrived at term, and being alive, can be saved by operation. To wait for its death would be, in my opinion, a surgical blunder that could properly be characterized as worse than a crime."

Dr. J. Portman Chesney.

"Perform laparotomy. You will probably save two lives thereby; delay it and you *positively* lose one, possibly two. The danger to the mother in removing the dead foetus is even greater than that of removing the living."

Dr. P. Gourdin De Saussure.

"When the child is alive at full term operate for its and its mother's safety; never wait."

Dr. J. F. Moran.

"Yes, should operate at once; results more favorable to mother."

Dr. J. E. Kelly.

"Assuming that the foetus had reached a viable period and that the physician had diagnosed the fact—both most improbable assumptions—the physician should remove the foetus. This is the only possible method affording the foetus its inherent right to a chance of life."

Dr. Howard A. Kelly.

The brilliant results obtained by several skillful operators show the soundness of an active policy.

“The child can be saved, but extra-uterine children are apt to be feeble or deformed. The mother’s chances are better after the death of the child. If the child were discovered to be alive in the course of the examination of the case, the proper mode of treatment would be to open the abdomen and remove the living child, if possible at the same time removing the whole of the sac with the placenta. If the placental adhesions were such that this organ could not be removed with safety, the cord should be cut off close to the placenta, which should be allowed to drain itself of its blood, after which the abdominal cavity should be carefully cleansed and the incision into the abdomen closed completely without drainage.

“I have removed two children from the abdomen, large and fully developed, five months beyond the normal end of pregnancy.”<sup>1</sup>

Dr. W. T. Lusk.

“I have advocated removing the foetus because of danger incident to waiting, but I would operate even if the child was not viable. Every moment’s delay increases the danger to the mother. I believe no one of the thirteen children extracted alive (in cases of ectopic pregnancy) are now living. Eastman’s child lived, however, nine months. With our present knowledge, I believe the mother must be our first consideration in the rare cases where the life of the ovum is not extinguished by natural causes.”<sup>2</sup>

Dr. T. A. Emmet.

Times and circumstances vary but the operation

“In consequence of my religious tenets, I have not been free in the past to act as a surgeon when the life of the child

<sup>1</sup> This remarkable achievement goes to prove that both excessive haste and complete abstention must be deprecated.

<sup>2</sup> Such a statement of Dr. Lusk, substantiated by other eminent surgeons, is ethically of the highest importance. It proves beyond a doubt that the operations by which the child is removed in cases of ectopic pregnancy are not directly and immediately life-destroying. If, then, the lives of the mother and child are in great danger, these operations are, to say the least, permissible.

had to be sacrificed, and consequently in such cases I have never operated. My experience had been confined to making the diagnosis in a large number of cases in consultation, after which I have withdrawn from all further responsibility, with one single exception where, under existing circumstances, I urged the use of electricity to save the mother. As a surgeon I would answer this question on general principles, that the operation, when undertaken, should be done quickly, and entirely in the interest of the mother. While I fully recognize the obligation to the foetus, that it should receive the grace of baptism if possible, I also realize from a surgical standpoint, that the life of the mother could be easily lost in a division of interests.

“N. B.—The incandescent knife, in my judgment, would not be of any special advantage in prolonging the life of the foetus, or to lessen the hemorrhage; and to open the sac quickly that the child might be baptized before its death, I would prefer to use the means generally employed.

“In every case of abdominal pregnancy when the child had already nearly reached full term, I would wait for the completion, if it were safe to do so, and then save its life by removal. Under the circumstances, the claims of the child for the preservation of its life, are equally as great as those of the mother. And while the danger to the mother is increased, *in justice* she should be subjected to the additional risk to save the child.”<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Some persons object to Roman Catholic obstetricians on account of their well-known aversion for anything that savors of life-destruction; but others prefer them for this very reason. Not a jot, not a tittle of the law must be disregarded, but its meaning must not be stretched beyond its natural comprehension. We think it would be wrong to cast on the dividing of membranes in ectopic pregnancies the blame attached to craniotomy, which is ‘a sad and disgusting procedure.’

#### I. *In Ectopic Gestation*

the dividing of membranes is primarily intended to stop the hemorrhage and ligate the vessels which are, or are soon to be, disrupted;

#### I. *In Craniotomy*

the child is killed first in order that the mother may survive; the death of the child is really the means used to save the life of the mother;

Dr. Mordecai Price.

Do not wait  
until the child  
is dead.

“Operate in all cases as soon as the diagnosis is made.— I send you report of case at term, report answers some of your questions.”

Dr. Jos. Taber Johnson.

“Yes to the first part. He should not wait until it is dead, but remove it alive,—which he can almost certainly do and leave the placenta to the chances of absorption, or coming away in pieces afterwards. He may find it possible to ligate the vessels.”

Dr. John F. Roderer.

“When rupture of the tube takes place between the folds of the broad ligament, then the growth of the foetus may go on to full term, or it may die after a certain time and be absorbed as an extra-peritoneal haematricle ; or after it dies, it may suppurate and be discharged through the bladder, vagina, or some part of the intestinal tract, or it may remain quiet as lithopedion. It can also, by rupturing again through the wall of the broad ligament, become an abdominal pregnancy.

2. the action is not *directly* life-destroying, but *directly* remedial and *indirectly*, though often, life-destroying ;

3. the child is forcing its way by destroying tissues which nature did not intend to be severed. It is therefore unconsciously invading the rights of the mother ;

4. unless these membranes are severed, the child will almost infallibly destroy its mother and will itself perish in the blood which it will have caused to flow, come out in decomposing shreds, or be turned into a lithopedion ;

5. the death of the child is not certain and immediate, as the success of Drs. Lusk, Howard Kelly, Joseph Price and others, show conclusively.

2. the action is *directly* life-destroying and *indirectly* remedial ;

3. the child, when destroyed, is seeking to reach the outside world by the ways marked out by nature. It is therefore using its right ;

4. other ways are at hand for the doctor. He may have recourse to symphysiotomy, laparo-elytomy, or Caesarean section ;

5. the death of the child is both infallible and immediate.



“When the child is alive, it can be saved by abdominal section. The physician should wait until the child is viable. The treatment of the placenta while the child is viable is difficult. After death the placenta is absorbed. During the absorption of the placenta the mother is exposed to great danger. For that reason and also for the greater reason that he can save the child, the physician should never wait for the death of the child in order to operate, even if he has more trouble in dealing with the placenta.”

Dr. E. E. Montgomery.

“While the death of the foetus and the subsequent arrest of the circulation of its placenta will decrease the danger to the mother, yet I should feel, where the child was alive and had reached, or nearly reached, its full term, the operation should be done with a view to save the lives of both individuals.”

Dr. C. Henri Leonard.

“Doubtful.—No ; the mother claims first attention *always.*”

Dr. L. H. Dunning.

“Usually. Still an undecided question. Don't know how I should decide at the bedside. Have never been compelled to. Usually the mother's chances of recovery are increased by waiting, if we may trust reports of cases.”

Dr. J. M. Emmert.

“Wait until the circulation has ceased, and symptoms of disturbances from its pressure present themselves, then reopen the abdomen and remove it. Often times, the peritoneum will digest the placenta, and it will give no trouble. These answers are brief, but I presume that is what you want.”

Dr. E. C. Dudley.

“The child is rarely, if ever, saved beyond a few hours or days. *The best modern conclusion is that an ectopic pregnancy should be considered in the light of a malignant tumor and treated as such.* After pregnancy has gone to term or nearly to term, the great danger to the mother is hemorrhage at time of operation ; to avoid this, the surgeon would some-

However  
some qualify  
their approval  
of an active  
policy, or even  
prefer an ex-  
pectant one.

times be warranted in postponing operation until the death of the child. A positive diagnosis in early ectopic pregnancy is a very strong indication for an immediate operation to avoid hemorrhage from rupture."

Dr. Barton Cooke Hirst.

"1. Yes: it has been done a number of times. 2. Not necessarily: but the operation after foetal death and atrophy of the placenta is usually safer for the mother."

Dr. Robert P. Harris.

"1. Yes, in very rare instances.

2. As a general rule; it is safe to wait until the foetus has been some time dead."

Dr. R. B. Maury.

"The child may be saved, but the mother's life is greatly imperiled by operating while the child is alive, near term. It is best in the interest of the mother to wait until the child has been several months dead."

Dr. I. S. Stone.

"1. Often can be saved. In fact generally can be saved.

"2. No. (Note—I speak from the standpoint of the surgeon; a physician merely, who could not hope to operate successfully might wait with propriety, but surgeons are always to be had and hence 'No' to this question.)"

Dr. Charles P. Noble.

"From a medical standpoint he should do that which gives the mother the best chance. Experience must determine this in the future. Heretofore surgeons have usually waited until after foetal death. Their present tendency is to operate without delay."

Dr. Matthew D. Mann.

"The profession is rapidly coming to the opinion that with a live child near full term an operation should be done and the child given a chance for its life. The risk to the mother is not too great."

Dr. Joüon, (*Grossesse Tubaire*, p. 55.)

"If hemorrhage puts on at once an acute form, interference is imperative, but 'be not dismayed,' says Prof. Le Dentu, 'whenever haematocele is ushered in by threatening symp-

To operate in time to save the child, if possible, is the present tendency of the profession.

Avoid both undue haste and procrastination.

toms (par des symptomes très bruyants), calmly await developments ; if three or four hours later, the symptoms become more alarming, operate boldly ; otherwise, wait until the sluggishness, or the altered character of reabsorption compels you to interfere.' Mr. Pozzi agrees : 'The question, which was an open one a few years ago, is no more *sub judice*. Whenever hemorrhage threatens the life of the patient, you must seek the blood-spring, be it an external wound or an internal rupture.' To delay and rely on spontaneous hemostasis, is, in almost every case, to let the woman die in order to shirk responsibility for an operation which is far less dangerous than expectancy."

Dr. Lawson Tait, (op cit. p. 556.)

"I advocate the principle of saving a child who has survived the catastrophe of the primary rupture of the tube by being extended into the broad ligament. If its existence is recognized during its life, the mother ought to be carefully guarded and watched till the false labor sets in . . . From this point of view, therefore, neither the time selected for the operation nor the details of the proceeding will be influenced save by two considerations, *not to operate before the child is likely to be viable*, provided the delay necessary does not prejudice the mother ; and *not to delay* at all after the death of the child."

Such is the evidence which we were enabled to gather ; the work of the compiler is done ; may it prove of service to the theologians and moralists, whose duty it is to tell us :

*Quid deceat quid non, quo virtus, quo ferat error.*

R. I. HOLAIND, S.J.

**MODIFICATIONS OF PREVIOUS SOLUTIONS BY PP. LEHMKUHL,  
S.J. AND AERTNYS, C.SS.R.**

WE have already called attention to the many-sided possibility of physiological treatment in the case of ectopic gestation, and to the consequent difficulty for the casuist in moral theology who attempts the solution of the problem involved. The testimony of medical practitioners of the first order, in this department of their profession, which is found in the present issue of the REVIEW, gives the student some idea of this difficulty. Few theologians would venture any opinion, and we may consider it especially fortunate, under the circumstances, to have obtained three authorities who propose to enter the ranks for a discussion, not, indeed, to settle the difficulty by a statement which they hold to be apodeictic, but to test each portion of the problem and to obtain the weight and measure of complex facts by the application of principles to each in detail and all in the gross.

It is characteristic of men thorough in the intellectual professions, that whilst they are definite in their statements they are no less distrustful as to the exclusive correctness of them. This was the disposition in which PP. Lehmkühl, Aertnys and Sabetti entered the discussion. They were each prepared to relinquish their own views as they had at first, frankly and independently of each other, stated them, provided any proposition on their part could be legitimately impugned. This is not the least instructive part of the present argument, the fundamental difficulties of which could in nowise have been cleared so effectually as by a discussion between disputants of such calibre and temper.

To show the progress of the argument we give here the modification of their opinions, received by us from PP. Lehmkühl and Aertnys immediately after they had seen the symposium of their solutions with that of P. Sabetti.<sup>1</sup>

The Rev. P. Lehmkühl comments upon the discussion in the November number as follows :

<sup>1</sup> The text of these modifications reached us just as we had gone to press with the December number. P. Lehmkühl has since then replied to the "Animadversiones" by P. Sabetti, as seen in the article "Excisio foetus atque ejus directa occisio," which we publish in the present issue.

Quaestiones propositae fidentius et certius sane solvi poterunt, si responsa medicorum et physiologorum fuerint certiora: nam hucusque nondum omnia sunt enodata.

Difficile, quantum opinor, est determinare tempus, et condiciones matris, in quibus liceat ad operationem procedere, etsi eam non utcunque illicitam habes. Quod tetigi in meo responso in hoc periodico fascic praeced. inserto pag. 350.

Clarius id faciam, adjungendo aliquas observationes circa ea, quae eodem illo loco pag. 337 et 338 in "Conclusionem" dicta sunt. Conclusio illa duas habet partes, scilicet: (1) quid licere videatur in dubio insolubili extrauterinae graviditatis, (2) quid in certa graviditate extrauterina.

In 2<sup>a</sup> igitur parte dicitur: "Let us assume that the growth is really an ectopic cyst containing an embryo, and a rupture, most probably fatal, both to the mother and to the child, is imminent, what must you do? I answer with great diffidence: . . . Perform abdominal section, open the cyst and baptize the child . . . You cannot save its tiny body, you can save, at least, the soul. It cannot be said that you kill, although you indirectly cause its actual death, etc." Quod Auctor "Conclusionis" ibi pro modestia sua "cum magna diffidentia" se proferre dicit, equidem puto satis fidenter et sine practica dubitatione teneri posse, *si modo vere imminet fatalis seu letalis ruptura organorum maternorum*. Verum, utrum periculum illud fatale certo immineat, an nondum satis certo letale sit pro matre, sed sine letali ejusmodi exitu foetus ulterius evolvi usque ad tempus quo securius baptizetur, vel fortasse usque ad aetatem vitae extrauterinae possit, id, si rem bene intelligo, medicis difficile erit determinare. Quam primum hoc negare, illud affirmare bebent, theologica difficultas, ex mea sententia, non adest. Tum enim censeo, licite adhiberi non eas quidem operationes, quae tendunt primo in foetum occidendum et consequenter in eum removendum, sed eas, quae tendunt directe in tumorem fatalem seu foetum removendum eique baptismi possibilitatem conciliandam, etsi consequenter secum trahant mortis foetus accelerationem:—quae permittitur, non intenditur.

In 1<sup>ma</sup> parte "Conclusionis" dicitur: "When it is impossible to find out the nature of the growth, the physician has the right to assume that it is not a child, because monstrosities are not to be supposed." Quod responsum non hoc sensu approbare possum, quasi propter praesumptionem naturalis ordinis servati liceat agere, acsi extrauterina conceptio non adsit. Imo quia, utut *certus* non est

foetus qui pereat, tamen adest *periculum* foetum directe perimendi, solum ejusmodi operationes adhibere licebit, quas licet, quando de graviditate extrauterina certo constat, i. e. excisionem totius tumoris cum foetu dubio, non arefactionem aliamve operationem qua tumor cum foetu fortasse existente evanescat. Nam actio, *qua directe perimit*, sive contra foetum certum, sive contra foetum dubium exercetur, est illicita intrinsecus; sicut intrinsecus illicitum est explodere sclopetum in rem, de qua sive certus sive dubius sum, sit homo vivus. Attamen paullo facilius ad excisionem procedere medicum posse, puto. Nam quum dubium solum sit, an existat foetus, cujus vita per operationem in discrimen vocatur, imo praesumptio quaedam, eum non existere: puto non tantam certitudinem letalis periculi pro matre necessariam esse, ut operationem adhibere liceat ad matris vitam protegendam, quantam, si foetus existentia est certa.

*Exaeten in Hollandia.*

AUG. LEHMKUHL, S.J.

The Rev. P. Aertnys, in view of the data obtained through the discussion, modifies his previous solution, adding in the letter which accompanies the same, the following: *Nihil aliud intendere debemus, quam ut veritas eluceat; quapropter, si me errasse compererim, ad sententiam mutandam semper paratus sum.* We append the words of the illustrious disciple of St. Alphonsus:

Invitationi tuae morem gessi, ut, si quid in mea casus resolutione mutare vel addere vellem id quam primum perficerem tibi remitterem, et revera Quaestione de novo ponderata meliusque perspecta, agnovi aliqua mutanda atque addenda esse; haec autem in folio hisce litteris adjuncto adnotavi. Quaestionem hic iterum prout rectum mihi videbatur resolvere, salvo meliori judicio me sapientiorum.

Ad I. Juxta doctrinam Medicorum<sup>1</sup> Medicus non facile nec cito potest certiores se reddere num praegnatio ectopica revera adsit. Experientia factis praeteritis comparata Medicos docuisse debet utrum tumores ejusmodi frequenter an raro sint foetus.

<sup>1</sup> Cfr. Dr. O. Kresz. *Die Geheimnisse der Zeugung*. Kap. 30.—Surbled. *La morale dans ses rapports avec la medecine et l'hygiene*, liv. 4, chap. 15.

Porro, in dubio positivo utrum pregnatio ectopica revera adsit, jus certum tuendi vitam matris praevallet contra merum *periculum* occidendi hominem, et hac ex parte assentior responsioni Damiani.

Si constat verum adesse foetum, approbo operationem chirurgicam, qua foetus non directe occidatur, sed tantum in lucem educatur, dummodo nempe foetus *vitalis* sit; quia tunc adest, non abortus, sed solummodo *partus praematuri* procuratio, quae justa de causa licita est. Si foetus non est vitalis, sed jam ventrem matris egredi conatur, et in eo est ut organa matris dirumpat cum periculo vitae matris, etiam tum approbo operationem, quae tendat dumtaxat ad removendum periculum matris in exitu foetus; quia tunc neque procuratur abortus, quippe qui jam naturaliter accidit, neque foetus occisio, cum in mortem ejus non influat, utpote quae ex abortu naturali secutura est. Extra istos casus, approbare nequeo neque membranarum perforationem, neque effusionem humorum qui in tunicella ceu cysto continentur; quia, ut recte notat Damianus, hae operationes directe occidunt foetum immaturum: neque approbare possum divisionem membranarum per cultrum platineum electrico aestu candentem; nam haec operatio est vera abortus procuratio, qua foetus directe occiditur. Neque dicere juvat eam esse meram mortis *permissionem*; id quippe falsum est, nam est *actio mortifera*, qua *efficitur* ut foetus arte eductus mox perimatur, haud secus ac mersio hominis in mare, qua efficitur ut mox suffocetur.

Subsequently P. Aertnys confirms the view that, in a case of doubtful gestation, the *certain right* of the mother to save her life must prevail against the *mere danger* of killing the child. He says:

Etenim juxta doctrinam Theologorum non est reus homicidii ille, qui, justa et proportionata extante causa, exercet actionem periculosam, ex qua interdum mors hominis evenit, dummodo debitam diligentiam adhibeat ad occisionem cavendam; quia tunc occisio, si contingat, non est voluntaria, sed casualis. Cf. S. Alph. Lib. iii, n. 398. Atqui in dubia utrum tumor in ventre mulieris foetus sit an quid aliud, foetum esse non est praesumendum, cum praegnatio extra-uterina rara sit. Ergo salus mulieris causa sufficiens est ad exponendum se periculo occidendi foetum, et, si praeter intentionem occisio contingat, erit homicidium casuale.

As regards the second question in which a doubt has been raised whether the child *ectopic* may not be considered in the

light of an unjust (materially) aggressor upon its mother's life, P. Aertnys holds that this assumption cannot be sustained by reasonable argument. The infant is not in an active but in a wholly passive condition.

Porro me iudice, falso asseritur infantem esse aggressorem materialiter injustum ; etenim, sive in utero existat sive alibi reconditus sit, nequaquam mortem intentat matri, siquidem non ipse actione propria conatur egredi, sed corpus matris infantem expellit et haec expulsio a matre emanans fit matri causa mortis. Infans ergo non est *aggressor*, et multo minus est aggressor *injustus*, sed conatus ventris materni mortifer est. Itaque haec theoria injustae aggressionis, mea sententia, est mera fictio.

JOS. AERTNYS, C.SS. R.

---

#### EXCISIO FÆTUS ATQUE EJUS DIRECTA OCCISIO.

Post diversa theologorum vota circa casum extrauterinae graviditatis in hisce libellis periodicis publicata in animo mihi non erat, in controversiam de hac re intrare, sufficere arbitratus, ut lectori sententiae proponerentur : ex quibus quoad ultimam practicam conclusionem mea sententia cum sententia P. Sabetti fere convenerat. Verum quum nunc haec mea sententia impugnetur, puto, me lectori id debere, ut, quod antea seripseram, defendam atque stabiliam.

Omnis, quae inter me et P. Sabetti existit quaestio, in eo versatur : I° utrum in casu nostro *excisio* fœtus *certo sit directa occisio*, an satis probabiliter id negari possit ; prius P. Sabetti tenet, ego teneo alterum. II° Utrum in casu nostro foetus satis probabiliter dici possit injustus vitae maternae aggressor, an id negari debeat : dicit P. Sabetti, ego nego.

Ad I<sup>m</sup> P. Sabetti quidem dicit, *id patere*, videlicet excisionem fœtus esse directam ejus occisionem. Verum id, non probabili tantum ratione, sed invicte probari debet. Ratio, quae ad id probandum affertur, haec sola est, quod mors fœtus seu mortis acceleratio necessario cum illa excisione conjungatur.



Equidem fassus sum et fateor, cum illa excisione necessario conjungi mortis foetus accelerationem, atque foetum privari medio ad continuandam vitam necessario; sed negavi et nego, inde certo concludi posse, eam esse directam occisionem: quod exemplo naufragii demonstravi. Qui enim in naufragio, natandi imperitus, a tabula arrepta in mare prosilit, vel occupatam tabulam sibi soli servans alterum ex ea deturbat, ut alteruter salvetur, quum uterque non possit salvari; is se vel alterum privat etiam medio ad continuandam vitam necessario, neque directam committit sui vel proximi occisionem. Videtur tamen P. Sabetti etiam hoc pro illicito habere, quum dicat, in illo casu naufragii hominem se negative tantum habere. At, quamvis in hac re diversae existant opiniones, aliis dicentibus, non licere mihi cedere tabulam amico, nisi habeam peritiam natandi, vel nisi agatur de tabula nondum arrepta, aliis, id plane licere, imo ex doctrina S. Thomae id esse perfectissimae virtutis: negari nequit, omnino probabilem et practice tutam esse eam multorum theologorum sententiam, quae cum S. Thoma actionem illam a macula directae occisionis defendit. Ballerini-Palmieri in "Opere theologico Morali," trac. vi, sect. v, n. 25 hanc quaestionem etiam tractat atque ita concludit: "Ceterum ex communissima doctrina licita potes, sed non teneris, cedere tabulam, etiam apprehensam, ceteris paribus." Qui autem simpliciter affirmat, licere cedere tabulam, licitam etiam declarat actionem, qua haec cessio fit efficax. Incidens autem tabulae eam cedere efficaciter nequit, nisi positive se habeat vel prosiliens in mare, vel alteri facultatem tribuens, ut ab ipso in mare projiciatur.

Et re vera *complures* cogitari possunt actiones, quae in ordinariis circumstantiis vel sint directa occisio vel ei acquivaleant, quae nihilominus in extraordinariis circumstantiis longissime absint ab illa malitia, sed solam mortis incurrendae permissionem continent. Praeter allatum exemplum liceat aliud afferre, in quo actio etiam propinquius cum morte seu occisione conjuncta est, quam in nostra foetus excisione, neque tamen actio illa pro directa occisione habetur. Sume e. g. factum Eleazari, quod narratur in

S. Scriptura, *1 Mach. 6, 43 sq.*, qui ut cladem hostibus inferret, elephantem occisurus, ei se supposuit, a bestia conterendus; vel factum Samsonis, *Jud. 16, 30*, qui concutiens columnas domus se ipsum cum hostium multitudine simul interfecit. De quibus factis praestat breviter audire Lessium, *De Justitia et Jure L. 2 cap. 9 n. 32*: "Nec obstat, quod S. Augustinus dicat Samsonem non excusari, nisi quia Spiritus latenter hoc jusserat; quia alii hic nullam talem jussionem censent necessariam. Vide Cajetanum in illum locum, et Ambros. *L. 1 officior. c. 40*, ubi factum Eleazari, quod est omnino simile, valde laudat. Idem tenet Lopez, *1 p. cap. 65 in fine*, et multi recentiores."

Atque etiam Lugo hanc illius facti interpretationem, qua sumitur pro *indirecta* occisione, ac proiu non intrinsecus mala, in celeberrimo opere "De Justitia et Jure," *disp. 10. n. 55*, admittit. Imo eodem loco n. 51 seq., discutit fusius casum de milite injiciente ignem in tormentarium pulverem ad evertendam turrin hostium, ex quo certum sit momento eundem militem dissipandum. Post plura disputata haec habet: Difficultas est, quando *certum* est non posse propriam mortem vitari, quando ignem injicis vel ad turrin vel ad navem dissipandam, an id liceat, ut adversarios conteras vel debilites. Utrunque enim videntur esse rationes (i. e. tum quae suadeant, id licere, tum quae suadeant contrarium.) . . . Fortissime tamen urget, quod in eo casu non te directe occidis, neque id intendis, sed indirecte et praeter intentionem: directe enim solum vis occidere hostes, licet praeter intentionem *eodem ictu vel incendio pereas*.—Ergo gravissimus ille auctor admittit omnino fieri posse, ut ex actione aliqua necessario et proxime sequatur mors innocentis, neque ea actio dicenda sit directa occisio, quando videlicet aequae immediate effectus bonus proportionatus directe intentus, sequatur.

Stat ergo saltem mea sententia, non esse invicte probatum, excisionem foetus esse ejus directam occisionem ex eo, quod ejus mors necessario cum excisione jungatur vel quod privetur medio ad vitam continuandam necessario; quare licebit porro opinari, eam excisionem, gravissimis occurenti-

bus circumstantiis, pro sola indirecta occisione seu mortis permissione haberi posse, eamque tum licitam evadere.

Ingens autem discrimen dico intercedere inter ejusmodi excisionem et craniotomiam. In qua posteriore occiditur infans, ut per ejus occisionem et concisionem atque *consequenter ad eam* mater salvetur; nam per foetûs occisionem possibilis evadit ejus extractio, qua mediante mater salvetur. In nostro casu *primo* sequitur foetûs extractio et matris liberatio, *consequenter* foetûs extinctio.—Haec de 1<sup>ma</sup> nostra quaestione, circa quam de cetero conferri possunt, quae habeo in mea *Theologia Morali I, n., 843 sq.* Quae enim ibi de casu simili, at non eodem, dixi dubitanter, multo fidentius ad nostram rem transferenda puto, quum in illo casu de naturali graviditate agatur et demum per sectionem Cæsaream foetus vivus et in statu vitali probabiliter in lucem edi possit: quod in casu nostro ex suppositione impossibile est.

Brevior ero in quaestione 2<sup>da</sup>.

Potestne in nostro casu foetus probabiliter dici injustus aggressor? Pro inconcusso habere debemus, hunc rei concipiendae modum fieri *non posse*, quando agitur de graviditate consueta seu uterina. Obstat decretum S. Officii d. d. 31 Maji 1884. Aggressor quidem, si ita loqui vis, vitae maternae foetus in utroque casu, sive consuetae sive ectopicae graviditatis, aequè bene dici potest. *Injustitia* aggressionis igitur peti debet ex hoc innaturali situ ipsius foetus. Verum cogitare non possum, quid injustitiae, etsi materialis tantum, hic ex parte foetûs committatur vel commissum sit. Conditio foetûs tota, qualis existit, causata est ab ipsis parentibus et causis naturalibus; imo vitium naturae non est ex foetu sed ex parentibus. Quare a foetu committitur, mea pace, aggressio quidem, sed non aggressio injusta. Equidem puto, si unquam ad theoriam injusti aggressoris questio nostra reducatur, in tuto positam non esse decretum S. Officii, quo craniotomia proscribitur.

AUG. LEHMKUHL, S.J.

## CONFERENCES.

## OUR CRITICISM OF THE CATHOLIC DICTIONARY.

It is gratifying to know that a change is to be effected in some of the objectionable features of the "Catholic Dictionary" which were pointed out by us a short time ago. Messrs. Benziger Bros., publishers of the American edition, write to us :

NEW YORK, December 1, 1893.

REVEREND DEAR SIR :—Referring to your criticism in the November number of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW on the treatment of the "Scapular" in the Catholic Dictionary, we beg leave to say that we have written to the publishers of the book, in London, asking them to have the article changed.

We had not read the book when we purchased our edition, but as it was claimed that it was "revised and corrected" we took it for granted that the "Scapular" article and any others that needed change had been looked after.

Very respectfully yours,

BENZIGER BROS.

This is prompt and honorable *amende* on the part of the American publishers, though they are not in the main responsible for the injury of misdirecting readers of the Dictionary on an important subject of Catholic devotion which, as it is, suffers enough from misrepresentations by those outside of the Church, who criticize without understanding. As a rule the good name of a firm is accepted as a sufficient guarantee for the quality of its publications; but Catholics find a greater safeguard in the "Imprimatur," which presupposes that a conscientious censor has indicated to the publishers not only the errors which absolutely require correction, but all such changes as may justly be deemed a *conditio sine qua non* for permitting the name of the ecclesiastical authorities to be placed upon the title-page.

The "Catholic Dictionary" appears to have not only this guarantee of approving censorship, but the endorsement of

such names as Cardinals Manning, Newman, Vaughan and that of the careful and learned Archbishop of New York. We say designedly "appears to have," for on close view much of the high sounding patronage rests merely on the skillful presentation of words never intended to recommend the Dictionary which we have before us. The writers of the Preface to the first edition say :

Their Eminences the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and Cardinal Newman have been pleased to express their *approbation of the undertaking*. Cardinal Manning wrote : "I am very glad to hear *that it is proposed to publish* a ' Dictionary of Catholic Theology and History.' It will supply a great want in our English literature."

This is the extent of Cardinal Manning's approbation. We italicize to show that he evidently had no knowledge of the contents of the *proposed* Dictionary and simply answered a note in which the projected work had been commended to him. Cardinal Newman's *approbation* is of the same character. He speaks of the Dictionary as a " desideratum in our literature," but does not intimate that he had ever seen it when he wrote his encouraging letter. Two or three gentlemen were asked to write single articles for the Dictionary, and their names are made to give additional flavor to the foregoing recommendations. But was there no censor? Yes. The Rev. Father Keough of the London Oratory is mentioned in the Preface as furnishing the writers with many valuable suggestions and corrections. "At the same time it is right to add that the ' Nihil obstat ' appended by him certifies indeed that *the limits of Catholic orthodoxy have been observed, but by no means implies the censor's personal agreement or sympathy with many of the opinions expressed.*" This gives us the key to the whole transaction. There would be no need in a work professedly Catholic, of a protest such as the authors make in Father Keough's behalf, unless it were meant to express just what it does express, viz: that no heretical doctrine has been allowed in the book. One of the two leading authors has, it is credibly reported, renounced the Catholic faith since he wrote his part of the Dictionary, and that fact, if it were needed to prove the serpent's trail in

the work, would justify suspicion, if not of heterodoxy, at least of loose views regarding Catholic devotion, and partial views regarding Catholic history. The hand that wrote the article on the "Scapular" is visible in other parts of the book. The *Nihil obstat*, therefore, means in this case no more than that Father Keough found no heretical teaching in the work and perchance prevented any from going into it. Father Keough's name does not appear on the present edition. The name of another is substituted as "Censor deputatus," who no doubt took for granted that what had passed others might be passed by him. Perhaps so, if all that is not opposed to Catholic doctrine can be said to be harmless to faith and devotion. The category of things dangerous to Christian intelligence and lowering the high standard of Catholic morality may never be ignored in popular books, where the ignorant or doubtful are bidden to find right knowledge, if not exact knowledge, of things pertaining to their religion.

We plead for a thorough revision of this book or else for one in its stead that does justice to the high object which it proposed to serve, and no less to the *bona fide* purchasers.

---

#### COMMUNION ADMINISTERED TO LATIN CATHOLICS BY PRIESTS OF ORIENTAL RITE.

According to the disciplinary regulations established by the Constitution of Benedict XIV, governing the liturgical observances of the different churches of the Western and Eastern rite, a Roman Catholic could not receive Holy Communion from a Greek priest. Where the contrary custom had obtained of Latin and Greek Catholics communicating indiscriminately under the form of fermented or unfermented bread, the Holy See tolerated it, with the injunction of gradually abolishing it so that each Church be brought to observe strictly its traditional and peculiar rite.

By a recent decree this rule has been modified, and Catholics of whatever rite may receive the Holy Communion at any time from a priest, whether he belong to the Latin or Greek rite

(in communion with the Holy See), provided there is no church or priest of their own rite in the locality.

The purpose of this concession is to obviate the frequent danger to which Catholics are exposed who dwell in a mixed population and at often great distance from a priest ministering in their own rite, of being prevented from complying with the Easter precept or receiving holy Viaticum. The faculty is, however, not restricted to these two cases, but exists, as stated above, for all who have not a church or priest of their own in the place where they live.

The Decree will be found in the *Analecta* of this issue.

#### MEMBERS OF THE G. A. R.

In reply to a question put to the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda by a member of the G. A. R., the Sacred Congregation has communicated the following decision to one of our Bishops :

“Socios de quibus agitur non esse inquietandos; sed catholici abstineant omnino a communicatione cum acatholicis in precibus, et generaliter in divinis.” (S. Congr. de Prop. Fide, d. 7, Jan., 1893.)

#### THE “IMPEDIMENTUM CRIMINIS EX MATRIMONIO ATTENTATO.”

In replying to a query regarding the “impedimentum criminis” in the December number of the REVIEW, we made a statement which is liable to misconstruction, although our meaning must have been evident from the context. We said :—

The “impedimentum criminis” need not have any application in the case, unless it be shown that there existed a *promissio intuitu futuri matrimonii post mortem conjugis veri*.—The “impedimentum criminis” is of the nature of the crime which plots against the life of a husband or wife, and includes the disposition to commit murder in so far as it is fostered by the intention of the surviving party after

the death of the legitimate husband or wife. The *promise* is therefore an essential feature of this impediment, because it tends to elicit or strengthen the wish to have one of the parties die.

A Reverend Correspondent notes the fact that we lay particular stress upon the *promise* of a future marriage, as if this was meant to exclude the fact that the impediment may arise "ex adulterio cum *matrimonio attentato de praesenti*." Certainly if a *promissio matrimonii* constitutes the essence of this impediment, then *a fortiori* a *matrimonium attentatum*, which is practically the promise assumed as already binding. What we intended to convey above was that the "adulterium" of itself would not constitute the impediment, but that the "promissio matrimonii" (or the attempt to contract it *de praesenti*) was required as an essential element of invalidation.

---

#### THE WRITTEN PERMIT FOR THE ERECTION OF THE "VIA CRUCIS."

*Qu.* Is the faculty granted in the Forma Facultatum ordinarily given to our clergy at their appointment to missionary duties by the bishops, a sufficient permit for the valid erection of the "Way of the Cross," or does each erection call for a special permit in writing?

*Resp.* For the valid erection of the "Via Crucis" the *written* consent of the Ordinary of the Diocese is required in each separate case. The question, whether our missionary "faculties" (Fac. extraord. c. 10) containing among other privileges that of erecting the "stations" in places not within the jurisdiction of the Franciscan Order, suffice for the validity of the act without a distinct permit in writing for each "Via Crucis erigenda," has been discussed in these pages from several points of view. The conclusion seems unavoidable that, unless the bishop (and, in case of private chapels, also the pastor or religious superior of the place) has sanctioned in writing the particular erection, the same is invalid. We repeat here the authority upon which this con-



clusion is based. In 1879 (21 Jun.) the S. Congregation Indulg. was asked :

An consensus Ordinarii *in scriptis* requiratur sub poena nullitatis *in singulis casibus pro unaquaque Stationum erectione*, vel sufficiat, ut sit generice praestitus pro erigendis Stationibus in certo numero ecclesiarum vel oratoriorum sine specifica designatione loci." *Resp. Affirmative* ad primam partem. *Negative* ad secundam.

Some time later the Holy See was informed that the above-mentioned injunction of obtaining the *consensus ordinarii in scriptis* had not been everywhere observed, but that many priests had acted upon the general faculty (Extraord. C. 10,) as sufficient, without having had further recourse to the bishops in each case ; that in consequence of this neglect the validity of erection remained in many cases questionable. The Holy Father was therefore asked to grant a *sanatio in radice* by which the defect of the original formality was cancelled. Leo XIII granted this request in 1883 (October 21), but desired that thenceforth the original form be strictly observed under pain of nullity, adding, "ad avertendum vero in posterum quodcumque dubium desuper legitima erectione Viae Crucis curent parochi vel rectores ecclesiarum in quibus modo exposito erecta fuit Via Crucis petere in scriptis ab Ordinario requisitum consensum pro qualibet erectione singillatim."

As the law on this subject seems still insufficiently understood a new "sanatio" appears desirable, for which the bishops only can make definite provision.

## ANALECTA.

**S. COMMUNIO PRO FIDELIBUS LATINI ET ORIENTALIS RITUS.**

*Ex S. Congregatione de Propaganda Fide Pro Negotiis Ritus Orientalis.*

In variis catholici orbis regionibus, in quibus diversorum rituum fideles permixti inveniuntur, deplorandum sane est saepe saepius nonnullos proprii ritus Ecclesia et sacerdote destitutos manere. Ex quo fit ut quidam ex illis propriae devotioni satisfacere, nec non christianae vitae fervorem per Sacramentorum frequentiam conservare et augere desiderantes, ex difficultate S. Communionem sumendi in proprio ritu, a S. Sede privilegium communicandi in ritu alieno etiam extra casus a iure permisso continuo expostulent; alii vero quam plurimi propter eandem rationem inducantur potius ad diuturnam Sacramentorum incuriam cum maximo eorum vitae spiritualis detrimento.

Hisce recursibus ac malis effectibus permota haec S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis ritus Orientalis per opportunum aliquod ac salutare remedium iisdem occurrere voluit. Hinc, de consilio Emorum Patrum praedictae S. Congregationis, SS. D. N. Leo PP. XIII, referente R. P. D. Augustino Archiep. Larissensi S. Congregationis de Prop. Fide Secretario in Audientia diei 2 Iulii anni 1893 sequens decretum edi et expediri mandavit: nimirum.

Quo utilius frequentia promoveatur SS. Sacramentorum, quae efficacissima sunt media a Christo Domino instituta ad procurandam salutem animarum, et quo opportunius duplex illud praedictum inconveniens de medio tollatur, omnibus fidelibus cuiuscumque ritus, sive latini, sive orientalis, degentibus in locis, in quibus non sit ecclesia aut sacerdos proprii ritus, facultas in posterum a S. Sede conceditur SS. Communionem, non modo in articulo mortis et paschali praecepto adimplendo, sed etiam quovis tempore devotionis gratia, iuxta ritum Ecclesiae existentis in praedictis locis, dummodo catholica sit, recipiendi.

Rmis Ordinariis committitur officium ut praesentis decreti notitiam ad suum quisque populum pervenire faciat.

Datum Romae ex aedibus eiusdem S. Congnis die 18 Augusti 1893.

✠ F. AUGUSTINUS *Archiep.* LARISSEN.  
ALOISIUS VECCIA, *Secretarius.*

## BOOK REVIEW.

**MORAL PHILOSOPHIE.**—Eine wissenschaftliche Darlegung d. sittlichen, einschliesslich d. rechtlichen Ordnung, von Victor Cathrein, S. J. Zweite, vermehrte u. verbesserte Auflage. 1893, Herder, St. Louis. B. I. pp. XIX, 538. B. II XVI, 662.

It is an encouraging sign of the state of ethical enquiry that a new edition of this great work has been so early demanded. The first edition met with a warm reception from friend and foe, and probably the hostile criticism given it both here and in Europe was the strongest proof of its sterling worth, for the censors seemed most annoyed because the author had not cast aside the principles of the Old Philosophy in order to strike out upon original, novel lines.

As the work on its first appearance was reviewed in these pages, we shall content ourselves with calling attention here simply to the principal additions and revisions made in this new issue.

The chapter on the Final End of Man, has been entirely recast bringing it closely in touch with the corresponding chapter in Fr. Costa-Rosetti's *Philosophia Moralis*. A new chapter has been inserted on the false theories regarding man's Final End, as advocated by Kant, social utilitarians and evolutionists. The chapter on the Nature of Morality is greatly remodelled, as are also the sections on the notion of Duty, and the autonomistic theory of duty.

Some other sections have been inserted, occasioned by recent increase in the literature of the subject. For instance, Fr. Nietzsche's book on *Jenseits vom Gut u. Boese* appeared two years ago. Fr. Cathrein gives a sketch of the grotesque form of egotism put forward by this writer, and refutes it under the general caption of Moral Scepticism.

Paul Carus is a name familiar to most American readers as the editor of *The Monist*, and author of several works of a philosophical character, amongst which may be mentioned *The Ethical Problem*. The *Monism* of Carus is out-and-out pantheism, though he objects to such a title, styling his peculiar form of it *Entheism*. His ethical

system is *Meliorism*. Universal nature, he holds, comprises a vast unity wherein all the elements are in constant transition from a lower to a higher state. Two sides are discernible in the progressive development—a mechanical, and a psychic. “They depend in a measure on man’s conscious participation ; and this conscious participation in the evolutionary process of the soul life is moral’activity. All actions that make for the preservation and furthering of the progress of psychic life are good ; those that hinder are evil.” But the individual agent—what of him? A wave, he is, on the ocean of the psychic life of humanity. The soul of the individual has immortality only in the soul of humanity. The individual may have immortality or at least future perdurance should the atoms now entering into his composition hereafter re-enter into a similar combination in another individual. The former will there revive in the latter. What a sublime immortality this, and what a stimulus towards lofty ethical striving ! Fr. Cathrein gives us a just and sufficiently comprehensive view of the tenets of Carus, in discussing the general theory of “Progress” as a moral principle.

Besides the changes and additions which we have indicated a great number of incidental topics of minor importance, have been re-touched.

It is with a certain assurance of its accomplishment that we echo the author’s wish to present in this second edition a further help “towards the victory of Truth,” for it is fully worthy of a champion’s place in that noble cause.

**ELEMENTARY COURSE OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.** Based on the principles of the best Scholastic Authors, adapted from the French of Brother Louis of Poissy, by the Brothers of the Christian Schools.—New York: P. O. Shea, 1893, pp. xxx. 535.

One is apt to take up a book like this with some misgivings. To fit even an elementary course of philosophy into the comparatively small compass of a modest 12-mo. volume seems a worse than impossible, a dangerous task. But as you read, page after page, it becomes more and more evident that the work has been done by one who has firmly grasped the essentials of philosophy and is pressing them into space which none but such a mind could find sufficiently ample.

The plan of the book as to speculative philosophy has, unless we are greatly mistaken, been adapted in the main from Sanseverino, and if so, we only regret that the great master has not been followed in his arrangement which places dynamilogy immediately after formal logic. For if the science of ideas and of the mind's faculties as criteria of truth are to be treated outside of psychology, this can only logically be done by premising the empirical side of the latter science.

The material of the book has been drawn mainly from the great recent interpreters of St. Thomas' "Wisdom"—Gondin, Liberatore, Zigliara, Gonzalez, Kleutgen, Taparelli, Prisco, etc. The thought of these philosophers is generally redigested, sometimes merely summarized or simply rendered in full. We cannot but think that the condensing process in sundry places has been carried too far, so that *brevior esset obscurus fit*. For instance, p. 84, it is said that the principle of the idealistic theory is "that the essence of the human soul consists in thought." This is certainly true of Descartes' theory. Is it true of idealism as such? Again, p. 116: "Rationalistic philosophers, especially of the Sensist school, maintain the possibility of the invention of language, but in the sense in which they explain it, it is an absurdity." It had been well to explain what that "sense" is whereof so grave a charge is made.

The sketch of the history of philosophy is extremely meagre, and considering the purpose of its being treated in the volume, something more seems to be required to make it of real service. A few additional pages would have accomplished this.

As a text-book for the class-room the work fills a hitherto vacant place on the list of our Catholic philosophical literature. It is the only complete manual of Philosophy in English for high school and college we possess. In the hands of a competent teacher, one who has made a thorough study of the works whereon it is based, it will be a useful means in forming the minds of our youth of both sexes on the principles of truth underlying both the physical sciences and revealed religion, and for introducing them to the sources of deeper learning. Students already versed in a course of philosophy will find it of service in fastening and crystallizing their present knowledge.

The English version is on the whole very creditable, all the more when we consider the difficulty of the subject. We would suggest some slight alterations, for the sake of clearness and accuracy, in a second edition, such as, for instance, in the explanation of what constitutes change, p. 217, which, in its present form, is hardly

intelligible to those not conversant with Latin. Special credit is due to the translator for the many valuable notes and references to kindred literature in English.

A no slight commendation of the work is the fact that Mgr. Amoni thought it of such merit as to render it from the original French into Latin.

**THE DOGMA OF PURGATORY.**—Illustrated by the Lives and Legends of the Saints. By Rev. F. X. Schoupe, S.J. Translated from the French. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1893.

In days when a plausible skepticism pervades every degree of social and professional life, a book which pleads in behalf of the Church Suffering is all the more useful because it awakens the thought and fear of death in those who are inaccessible to the urgings of higher motives. The author complains, and not unjustly, that the Dogma of Purgatory is too much forgotten by the majority of the faithful, and he seeks the cause in the vagueness of our notions concerning it. To dispel this more or less general ignorance among the faithful regarding one of the most efficacious and consoling doctrines of the Church, is the principal purpose of the present book. Accordingly the Catholic dogma is clearly set forth and forms the foundation of the exhaustive treatise. Around this doctrine is grouped the teaching of the Christian Fathers, which serves as the link of Catholic traditions through all the ages, concerning the nature, place and duration of the purifying state after death. This traditional belief is not binding upon our faith but still worthy of respectful acceptance as embodying the intellectual and pious convictions of learned and holy men, whose combined judgment forms a strong plea in favor of Catholic truth.

A third feature, which is simply illustrative of the doctrine of the Church in her dogmatic definitions and patristic teaching, consists in a collection of historical facts offering sufficient motives of credibility and which include apparitions of the dead and such other incidents as indicate the presence of departed spirits, and as a rule their wish to communicate with the living. That such apparitions take place at times, is attested by Holy Writ as well as by the generally admitted statements of many credible witnesses in all ages and localities. "Such facts," says Father Schoupe, "are too multiplied to admit of doubt; the only difficulty is to establish their

connection with the world of expiation. But when these manifestations coincide with the death of persons dear to us ; when they cease after prayers and reparations have been made to God in their behalf, is it not reasonable to see therein signs by which the souls make known their distress ? ” The author warns the reader against the two extremes of a too ready credulity on the one hand, and on the other, of that vapid skepticism which would ignore everything which appeals to supernatural evidence. The author’s reputation as a searching and solid scholar in theology and Sacred Scripture vouches for the trustworthiness of the matter offered to the reader, even though the facts themselves may not, from their very nature, be such as to show that particular quality of evidence which the unbeliever demands as a condition of accepting whatever does not appeal to his bodily senses.

In accordance with the twofold light in which Purgatory may be considered the author treats his subject in two parts, namely as the mystery of justice and as the mystery of mercy. The chapters are short, that is, comprehensive, the presentation is interesting and the whole is well written. The same excellent qualities which are found in the original, have been preserved by the able translator of the learned Jesuit’s book.

As a manual of spiritual reading, private or in community, and as an aid in fostering devotion to the poor souls and enlivening a sound Catholic faith, the volume deserves widespread attention.

**HOW PARISHES MAY ESTABLISH SCHOLARSHIPS.** By a priest of the Congregation of the Mission. Niagara University. Niagara Falls, N. Y.

What a far-reaching blessing it might prove if the thought suggested by the author of this little pamphlet were rightly carried out. The poor, more especially those of the rural districts, have at all times furnished the best candidates for the holy ministry. Removed, as a rule, from the seductions to which children in large cities are so easily accessible, the sons of the modest laborer preserve not only that simplicity of heart which, with industrious habits, becomes the best foundation for intellectual proficiency, but they are most capable of sympathizing with that vast majority of the Catholic body, the poor and abandoned, who need the leading and consolations of Christ’s holy religion amid humble circumstances. A member of the missionary Order of St. Vincent de Paul, devoted

to the training of students for the priesthood offers a simple plan by which in each parish a permanent fund might be established to enable some worthy child to pursue the preparatory course essential for entrance into the higher seminary. The suggestion is accompanied by a brief sketch setting forth the motives to induce parishioners to contribute to such a fund. Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained for the trifling cost of the printer's expense by addressing the authorities of Niagara University.

---

BOOKS RECEIVED.

**BREVIS NOTITIA ET CATALOGUS ARCHIVI SACRAE CONGREGATIONIS CAEREMONIALIS.** (Bibliothèque des Analecta Ecclesiastica. Revue Romaine. No. 1.) Cura R. D. Gregorii Palmieri, O.S.B. (Prix 2 fr.) En vente—50, Via Gregoriana. Rome, 1893.

**DIURNALE PARVUM**, sive Epitome ex Horis Diurnis continens Psalmos quotidie recitandos et Commune Sanctorum unacum Officio B.M.V. per annum, atque orationibus propriis sanctorum.—Editio IV.—Ratisbonae, Neo-Eboraci et Cincinnati: Frid. Pustet, 1893. (Pr. 1,35.)

**SUFFERING SOULS.** A Purgatorial Manual of indulgenced prayers, etc., by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Preston, D.D.—Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

**TONIC SOL FA MUSIC** for Catholic Choirs. Mass in honor of S. Brigid.—Benediction Service—Ave Maria.—Brown & Nolan: Nassau St., Dublin, Ireland.

**THE COMEDY OF ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM:** In three acts. Edited by A. F. Marshall, B.A., Oxon.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1894.

**SOME POPULAR HISTORICAL FALLACIES** examined. By the author of "The Religion of St. Augustine." Part 1.—London: Burns & Oates. (Benziger Bros.)

**LITTLE CATECHISM OF THE BL. VIRGIN AND OF ST. JOSEPH.** By the Marist Brothers.—London: Burns and Oates. (Benziger Bros.) Pr. Two pence.

**THE CHURCH AND THE AGE.** A Sermon by the Most Rev. John Ireland.—Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1893. Pr. .15.

**ALMANAC AND CALENDAR OF THE APOSTLESHIP OF PRAYER.** 1894. Central Direction, Philadelphia, Pa.



# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. X.—FEBRUARY, 1894.—No. 2.

## SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI LEONIS

DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPAЕ XIII. LITTERAЕ ENCYCLICAE.

*Ad Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, Episcopos Universos Catholici orbis Gratiam et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede Habentes.*

## DE STUDIIS SCRIPTURAE SACRAE.

Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis et Episcopis universis Catholici orbis gratiam et communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentibus.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles Fratres Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem,

PROVIDENTISSIMUS Deus, qui humanum genus, admirabili caritatis consilio, ad consortium naturae divinae principio evexit, dein a communi labe exitioque eductum, in pristinam dignitatem restituit, hoc eidem propterea contulit singulare praesidium, ut arcana divinitatis, sapientiae, misericordiae suae supernaturali via patefaceret. Licet enim in divina revelatione res quoque comprehendantur quae humanae rationi inaccessae non sunt, ideo hominibus revelatae, *ut ab omnibus expedite, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint, non hac tamen de causa revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, sed quia Deus ex infinita bonitate sua ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Vat. sess. iii cap. ii de revel.

Quae *supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis Ecclesiae fidem*, continetur tum *in sine scripto traditionibus*, tum etiam *in libris scriptis*, qui appellantur sacri et canonici, eo quod *Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt*<sup>1</sup>. Hoc sane de utriusque Testamenti libris perpetuo tenuit palamque professa est Ecclesia: eaque cognita sunt gravissima veterum documenta, quibus enuntiatur, Deum, prius per prophetas, deinde per seipsum, postea per apostolos locutum, etiam Scripturam condidisse, quae canonica nominatur<sup>2</sup> eandemque esse oracula et eloquia divina<sup>3</sup> litteras esse, humano generi longe a patria peregrinanti a Patre caelesti datas et per auctores sacros transmissas.<sup>4</sup> Iam, tanta quum sit praestantia et dignitas Scripturarum, ut Deo ipso auctore confectae, altissima eiusdem mysteria, consilia, opera complectantur, illud consequitur, eam quoque partem sacrae theologiae, quae in eisdem divinis Libris tuendis interpretandisque versatur, excellentiae et utilitatis esse quam maximae. Nos igitur, quemadmodum alia quaedam disciplinarum genera, quippe quae ad incrementa divinae gloriae humanaeque salutis valere plurimum posse viderentur, crebris epistolis et cohortationibus provehenda, non sine fructu, Deo adiutore, curavimus, ita nobilissimum hoc sacrarum Litterarum studium excitare et commendare, atque etiam ad temporum necessitates congruentius dirigere iamdiu apud Nos cogitamus. Movemur nempe ac prope impellimur sollicitudine Apostolici muneris, non modo ut hunc praeclarum catholicae revelationis fontem tutius atque uberius ad utilitatem dominici gregis patere velimus, verum etiam ut eundem ne patiamur ulla in parte violari, ab iis qui in Scripturam sanctam, sive impio ausu invehuntur aperte, sive nova quaedam fallaciter imprudenterve moliuntur. Non sumus

1 *Ibid.*

2 S. Aug. *de civ. Dei* xi, 3.

3 S. Clem. Rom. i ad Cor. 45; S. Polycarp. ad Phil. 7; S. Iren. *c. haer.* ii, 28, 2.

4 S. Chrys. *in Gen. hom.* 2, 2; S. Aug. *in Ps. xxx, serm.* 2, 1; S. Greg. M. ad Theod. *ep.* iv, 31.

equidem nescii, Venerabilès Fratres, haud paucos esse e catholicis, viros ingenio doctrinisque abundantes, qui ferantur alacres ad divinorum Librorum vel defensionem agendam vel cognitionem et intelligentiam parandam ampliorem. At vero, qui eorum operam atque fructus merito collaudamus, facere tamen non possumus qui ceteros etiam, quorum sollertia et doctrina et pietas optime hac in re pollicentur, ad eandem sancti propositi laudem vehementer hortemur. Optamus nimirum et cupimus, ut plures patrocinium divinarum Litterarum rite suscipiant teneantque constanter; utque illi potissime, quos divina gratia in sacrum ordinem vocavit, majorem in dies diligentiam industriamque iisdem legendis, meditandis, explanandis, quod aequissimum est, impendant.

Hoc enimvero studium cur tantopere commendandum videatur, praeter ipsius praestantiam atque obsequium verbo Dei debitum, praecipua causa inest in multiplici utilitatum genere, quas inde novimus manaturas, sponsore certissimo Spiritu Sancto: *Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata, utilis est ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad corripiendum, ad erudiendum in iustitia, ut perfectus sit homo Dei, ad omne opus bonum instructus.*<sup>1</sup> Tali sane consilio Scripturas a Deo esse datas hominibus, exempla ostendunt Christi Domini et Apostolorum. Ipse enim qui "miraculis conciliavit auctoritatem, auctoritate meruit fidem, fide contraxit multitudinem,"<sup>2</sup> ad sacras Litteras, in divinae suae legationis munere, appellare consuevit: nam per occasionem ex ipsis etiam sese a Deo missum Deumque declarat; ex ipsis argumenta petit ad discipulos erudiendos, ad doctrinam confirmandam suam; earundem testimonia et a calumniis vindicat obtrectantium, et Sadducaeis ac Pharisaeis ad coarguendum opponit, in ipsumque Satanam, impudentius sollicitantem, retorquet; easdemque sub ipsum vitae exitum usurpavit, explanavitque discipulis redivivus, usque dum ad Patris gloriam ascendit. Eius autem voce praeceptisque Apostoli conformati, tametsi dabat ipse *signa et prodigia fieri per manus eorum*<sup>3</sup>, magnam tamen effica-

1 II Tim. iii, 16-17.

2 S. Aug. *de util. cred.* xiv, 32.

3 Act. xiv, 3.

citatem ex divinis traxerunt Libris, ut christianam sapientiam late gentibus persuaderent, ut Iudaeorum pervicaciam frangerent, ut haereses comprimerent erumpentes. Id apertum ex ipsorum concionibus, in primis Beati Petri, quas, in argumentum firmissimum praescriptionis novae, dictis veteris Testamenti fere contexuerunt; idque ipsum patet ex Matthaei et Ioannis Evangeliiis atque ex Catholicis, quae vocantur, epistolis; luculentissime vero ex eius testimonio qui “ad pedes Gamalielis Legem Moysi et Prophetas se didicisse gloriatur, ut armatus spiritualibus telis postea diceret confidenter, *Arma militiae nostrae non carnalia sunt, sed potentia Deo.*”<sup>1</sup> Per exempla igitur Christi Domini et Apostolorum omnes intelligant, tirones praesertim militiae sacrae, quanti faciendae sint divinae Litterae, et quo ipsi studio qua religione ad idem veluti armamentarium accedere debeant. Nam catholicae viritatis doctrinam qui habeant apud doctos vel indoctos tractandam, nulla uspiam de Deo, summo et perfectissimo bono, deque operibus gloriam caritatemque ipsius prodentibus, suppetet eis vel cumulator copia vel amplior praedicatio. De Servatore autem humani generis nihil uberius expressiusque quam ea, quae in universo habentur Bibliorum contextu; recteque affirmavit Hieronymus, “ignorationem Scripturarum esse ignoracionem Christi”<sup>2</sup>: ab illis nimirum extat, veluti viva et spirans, imago eius, ex qua levatio malorum, cohortatio virtutum, amoris divini invitatio mirifice prorsus diffunditur. Ad Ecclesiam vero quod attinet, institutio, natura, munera, charismata ejus tam crebra ibidem mentione occurrunt, tam multa pro ea tamque firma prompta sunt argumenta, idem ut Hieronymus verissime edixerit: “Qui sacrarum Scripturarum testimoniis roboratus est, is est propugnaculum Ecclesiae.”<sup>3</sup> Quod si de vitae morumque conformatione et disciplina quaeratur, larga indidem et optima subsidia habituri sunt viri apostolici: plena sanctitatis praescripta, suavitate et vi condita hortamenta, exempla in omni virtu-

1 S. Hier. *de studio Script.* ad Paulin. ep. liii, 3.

2 *In Is. Prol.*

3 *In Is. liv, 12.*

tum genere insignia ; gravissima accedit, ipsius Dei nomine et verbus, praemiorum in aeternitatem promissio denunciatio poenarum.

Atque haec propria et singularis Scripturarum virtus, a divino afflatu Spiritus Sancti profecta, ea est quae oratori sacro auctoritatem addit, apostolicam praebet dicendi libertatem, nervosam victricemque tribuit eloquentiam. Quisquis enim divini verbi spiritum et robur eloquendo refert, ille, *non loquitur in sermone tantum, sed et in virtute et in Spiritu Sancto et plenitudine multa.*<sup>1</sup> Quamobrem ii dicendi sunt praepostere improvideque facere, qui ita conciones de religione habent et praecepta divina enuntiant, nihil ut fere afferant nisi humanae scientiae et prudentiae verba, suis magis argumentis quam divinis innixi. Istorum scilicet orationem, quantumvis nitentem luminibus, languesce et frigere necesse est, utpote quae igne careat sermonis Die,<sup>2</sup> eandemque longe abesse ab illa, qua divinus sermo pollet virtute: *Vivus est enim sermo Dei et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti, et pertingens usque ad divisionem animae ac spiritus.*<sup>3</sup> Quamquam, hoc etiam prudentioribus assentiendum est, inesse in sacris Litteris mire variam et uberem magnisque dignam rebus eloquentiam: id quod Augustinius pervidit diserteque arguit<sup>4</sup>, atque res ipsa confirmat praestantissimorum in oratoribus sacris, qui nomen suum assiduae Bibliorum consuetudini piaeque meditationi se praecipue debere, grati Deo affirmarunt.

Quae omnia Ss. Patres cognitione et us a quum exploratissima haberent, nunquam cessarunt in divinis Litteris earumque fructibus collaudandis. Eas enimvero crebis locis appellant vel thesaurum locupletissimum doctrinarum coelestium<sup>5</sup>, vel perennes fontes salutis<sup>6</sup>, vel ita proponunt quasi prata fertilia et amoenissimos hortos, in quibus grex domini-

1 I Thess. 1, 5.

2 Ierem. xxiii, 29.

3 Hebr. iv, 12.

4 *De doctr. chr.* iv, 6, 7.

5 S. Chrys. *in Gen. hom.* 21, 2 ; *hom.* 60, 3 ; S. Aug. *de discipl. chr.* 2.

6 S. Athan. *ep. fest.* 39.

cus admirabili modo reficiatur et delectetur<sup>1</sup>, Apte cadunt illa S. Hieronymi ad Nepotianum clericum: "Divinas Scripturas saepius lege, imo nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur; disce quod doceas . . . sermo presbyteri Scripturarum lectione conditus sit<sup>2</sup>"; convenitque sententia S. Gregorii Magni, quo nemo sapientius pastorum Ecclesiae descripsit munera: "Necesse est, inquit, ut qui ad officium praedicationis excubant, a sacrae lectionis studio non recedant<sup>3</sup>." Hic tamen libet Augustinum admonentem inducere, "Verbi Dei inanem esse forinsecus praedicatorum, qui non sit intus auditor<sup>4</sup>" eumque ipsum Gregorium sacris concionatoribus praecipientem, "ut in divinis sermonibus, priusquam aliis eos proferant, semetipsos requirant, ne insequentes aliorum facta se deserant."<sup>5</sup> Sed hoc iam, ab exemplo et documento Christi, qui *coepit facere et docere*, vox apostolica late praemonuerat, non unum allocuta Timotheum, sed omnem clericorum ordinem, eo mandato: *Attende tibi et doctrinae, insta in illis; hoc enim faciens, et teipsum salvum facies, et eos qui te audiunt.*<sup>6</sup> Salutis profecto perfectionisque et propriae et alienae eximia in sacris Litteris praesto sunt adiumenta, copiosius in Psalmis celebrata; iis tamen, qui ad divina eloquia, non solum mentem afferant docilem atque attentam, sed integrae quoque piaque habitum voluntatis. Neque enim eorum ratio librorum similis atque communium putanda est; sed, quoniam sunt ab ipso Spiritu Sancto dictati, resque gravissimas continent multisque partibus reconditas et difficiliores, ad illas propterea intelligendas exponendasque semper eiusdem Spiritus "indigemus adventu,"<sup>7</sup> hoc est lumine et gratia eius: quae sane, ut divini Psaltae frequenter instat auctoritas, humili sunt precatione imploranda, sanctimonia vitae custodienda.

1 S. Aug. *serm.* 26, 24; S. Ambr. *in Ps.* cxviii; *serm.* 19, 2.

2 S. Hier. *de vit. cleric.* ad Nepot.

3 S. Greg. M., *Regul. past.* II, 11 (*al.* 22); *Moral.* xviii, 26 (*al.* 14).

4 S. Aug. *serm.* 179, 1.

5 S. Greg. M., *Regul. past.* III, 24 (*al.* 48).

6 I Tim. iv, 16.

7 S. Heir. *in Mic.* 1, 10.

Praeclare igitur ex his providentia excellit Ecclesiae, quae, *ne caelesis ille sacrorum Librorum thesaurus, quem Spiritus Sanctus summa liberalitate hominibus tradidit neglectus iaceret*,<sup>1</sup> optimis semper et institutis et legibus cavit. Ipsa enim constituit, non solum magnam eorum partem ab omnibus suis ministris in quotidiano sacrae psalmodiae officio legendam esse et mente pia considerandam, sed eorundem expositionem et interpretationem in ecclesiis cathedralibus, in monasteriis, in conventibus aliorum regularium, in quibus studia commode vigere possint, per idoneos viros esse tradendam; diebus autem saltem dominicis et festis solemnibus fideles salutaribus Evangelii verbis pasci, restricte iussit.<sup>2</sup> Item prudentiae debetur diligentiaeque Ecclesiae cultus ille Scripturae sacrae per aetatem omnem vividus et plurimae ferax utilitatis. In quo, etiam ad firmanda documenta hortationesque Nostras, iuvat commemorare quemadmodum a religionis christianae initiis, quotquot sanctitate vitae rerumque divinarum scientia floruerunt, ii sacris in Litteris multi semper assidue fuerint. Proximos Apostolorum discipulos, in quibus Clementem Romanum, Ignatium Antiochenum, Polycarpum, tum Apologetas, nominatim Iustinum et Irenaeum, videmus epistolis et libris suis, sive ad tutelam sive ad commendationem pertinerent catholicorum dogmatum, e divinis maxime Litteris fidem, robur, gratiam omnem pietatis arcessere. Scholis autem catecheticis ac theologis in multis sedibus episcoporum exortis, Alexandrina et Antiochena celeberrimis, quae in eis habebatur institutio, non alia prope re, nisi lectione, explicatione, defensione divini verbi scripti continebatur. Inde plerique prodierunt Patres et scriptores, quorum operosis studiis egregiisque libris consecuta tria circiter saecula ita abundarunt, ut aetas biblicae exegeseos aurea iure ea sit appellata. Inter orientales principem locum tenet Origenes, celeritate ingenii et laborum constantia admirabilis, cuius ex plurimis scriptis et immenso Hexaplorum opere deinceps fere omnes hauserunt. Adnumerandi

1 Conc. Trid. sess. v, *decret. de reform.* 1.

2 *Ibid.* 1-2.

plures, qui huius disciplinae fines amplificaverunt: ita, inter excellentiores tulit Alexandria Clementem, Cyrillum; Palaestina Eusebium, Cyrillum alterum; Cappadocia Basilium Magnum, utrumque Gregorium, Nazianzenum et Nyssenum; Antiochia Ioannem illum Chrysostomum, in quo huius peritia doctrinae cum summa eloquentia certavit. Neque id praecclare minus apud occidentales. In multis qui se admodum probavere, clara Tertulliani et Cypriani nomina, Hilarii et Ambrosii, Leonis et Gregorii Magnorum; clarissima Augustini et Hieronymi: quorum alter mire acutus extitit in perspicienda divini verbi sententia, uberrimusque in ea deducenda ad auxilia catholicae veritatis, alter a singulari Bibliorum scientia magnisque ad eorum usum laboribus, nomine Doctoris maximi praeconio Ecclesiae est honestatus. Ex eo tempore ad undecimum usque saeculum, quamquam huiusmodi contentio studiorum non pari atque antea ardore at fructu viguit, viguit tamen, operâ praesertim hominum sacri ordinis. Curaverunt enim, aut quae veteres in hac re fructuosiora reliquissent deligere, eaque apte digesta de suisque aucta pervulgare, ut ab Isidoro Hispalensi, Beda, Alcuino factum est in primis; aut sacros codices illustrare glossis, ut Valafridus Strabo et Anselmus Laudunensis, aut eorundem integritati novis curis consulere, ut Petrus Damianus et Lanfrancus fecerunt. Saeculo autem duodecimo allegoricam Scripturae enarrationem bona cum laude plerique tractarunt; in eo genere S. Bernardus ceteris facile antecessit, cuius etiam sermones nihil prope nisi divinas Litteras sapiunt. Sed nova et laetiora incrementa ex disciplina accessere *Scholasticorum*. Qui, etsi in germanam versionis latinae lectionem studuerunt inquirere, confectaque ab ipsis *Correctoria biblica* id plane testantur, plus tamen studii industriaeque in interpretatione et explanatione collocaverunt. Composite enim dilucideque, nihil ut melius antea, sacrorum verborum sensus varii distincti; cuiusque pondus in re theologica perpensum; definitae librorum partes, argumenta partium; investigata scriptorum proposita; explicata sententiarum inter ipsas necessitudo et connexio; quibus ex rebus nemo unus non videt quantum sit luminis obscurioribus locis admotum. Ipso-



rum praeterea de Scripturis lectam doctrinae copiam admodum produnt, tum de theologia libri, tum in easdem commentaria; quo etiam nomine Thomas Aquinas inter eos habuit palmam. Postquam vero Clemens V decessor Noster Athenaeum in Urbe et celeberrimas quasque studiorum Universitates litterarum orientalium magisteriis auxit, exquisitius homines nostri in nativo Bibliorum codice et in exemplari litino elaborare coeperunt. Reverta deinde ad nos eruditione Graecorum, multoque magis arte nova libraria feliciter inventa, cultus Scripturae sanctae latissime accrevit. Mirandum est enim quam brevetaetatis spatio multiplicata praelo sacra exemplaria, *vulgata* praecipue, catholicum orbem quasi compleverint: adeo per id ipsum tempus, contra quam Ecclesiae hostes calumniantur, in honore et amore erant divina volumina. Neque praetereundum est, quantus doctorum virorum numerus, maxime ex religiosis familiis, a Viennensi Concilio ad Tridentinum, in rei biblicae bonum provenerit: qui et novis usi subsidiis et variae eruditionis ingeniique sui segetem conferentes, non modo auxerunt congestas maiorum opes, sed quasi munierunt viam ad praestantiam subsequuti saeculi, quod ab eodem Tridentino effluxit, quum nobilissima Patrum aetas propemodum rediisse visa est. Nec enim quisquam ignorat, Nobisque est memoratu iucundum, decessores Nostros, a Pio IV ad Clemente VIII, auctores fuisse ut insignes illae editiones adornarentur versionum veterum, Vulgatae et Alexandrinae; quae deinde, Sixti V eiusdemque Clementis iussu et auctoritate, emissae, in communi usu versantur. Per eadem autem tempora, notum est, quum versiones alias Bibliorum antiquas, tum polyglottas Antuerpiensem et Parisiensem, diligentissime esse editas, sincerae investigandae sententiae peraptas: nec ullum esse utriusque Testamenti librum, qui non plus uno nactus sit bonum explanatorem, neque graviozem ullam de iisdem rebus quaestionem, quae non multorum ingenia fecundissime exercuerit: quos inter non pauci, iique studiosiores Ss. Patrum, nomen sibi fecere eximium. Neque, ex illa demum aetate, desiderata est nostrum sollertia; quum clari subinde viri de iisdem studiis bene sint meriti, sacrasque Litteras contra *rationalismi*

commenta, ex philologia et finitimis disciplinis detorta, simili argumentorum genere vindicarint.—Haec omnia qui probe ut oportet considerent, dabunt profecto, Ecclesiam, nec ullo unquam providentiae modo defuisse, quo divinae Scripturae fontes in filios suos salutariter derivaret, atque illud praesidium, in quo divinitus ad eiusdem tutelam decusque locata est, retinuisse perpetuo omnique studiorum ope exornasse, ut nullis externorum hominum incitamentis egerit, egeat.

Iam postulat a Nobis instituti consilii ratio, ut quae his de studiis recte ordinandis videantur optima, ea vobiscum communicemus, Venerabiles Fratres. Sed principio quale adversetur et instet hominum genus, quibus vel artibus vel armis confidant, interest utique hoc loco recognoscere. Scilicet, ut antea cum iis praecipue res fuit qui privato iudicio freti, divinis traditionibus et magisterio Ecclesiae repudiatis, Scripturam statuerant unicum revelationis fontem supremumque iudicem fidei; ita nunc est cum Rationalistis, qui eorum quasi filii et heredes, item sententia innixi sua, vel has ipsas a patribus acceptas christianae fidei reliquias prorsus abiecerunt. Divinam enim vel revelationem vel inspirationem vel Scripturam sacram, omnino ullam negant, neque alia prorsus ea esse dictitant, nisi hominum artificia et commenta: illas nimirum, non veras gestarum rerum narrationes, sed aut ineptas fabulas aut historias mendaces; ea, non vaticinia et oracula, sed aut confictas post eventus praedictiones aut ex naturali vi praesensiones; ea, non veri nominis miracula virtutisque divinae ostenta, sed admirabilia quaedam, nequaquam naturae viribus maiora, aut praestigias et mythos quosdam: evangelia et scripta apostolica aliis plane auctoribus tribuenda. Huiusmodi portenta errorum, quibus sacrosanctam divinorum Librorum veritatem putant convelli, tamquam decretoria pronuntiata novae cujusdam *scientiae liberae*, obtrudunt: quae tamen adeo incerta ipsimet habent, ut eisdem in rebus crebrius immutent et suppleant. Quum vero tam impie de Deo, de Christo, de Evangelio et relinqua Scriptura sentiant et praedicent, non desunt ex iis qui theologi et christiani et evangelici haberi velint, et honestis-

simo nomine obtendant insolentis ingenii temeritatem. His addunt sese consiliorum participes adiutoresque e ceteris disciplinis non pauci, quos eadem revelatarum rerum intolerantia ad oppugnationem Bibliorum similiter trahit. Satis autem deplorare non possumus, quam latius in dies acriusque haec oppugnatione geratur. Geritur in eruditos et graves homines, quamquam illi non ita difficulter sibi possunt cavere; at maxime contra indoctorum vulgus omni consilio et arte infensi hostes nituntur. Libris, libelliis, diariis exitiale virus infundunt; id concionibus, id sermonibus insinuant; omni iam pervasere, et multas tenent, abstractas ab Ecclesiae tutela, adolescentium scholas, ubi credulas mollesque mentes ad contemptionem Scripturae, per ludibrium etiam et scurriles iocos, depravant misere. Ista sunt, Venerabiles Fratres, quae commune pastorale studium permoveant, incendiant; ita ut huic novae *falsi nominis scientiae*<sup>1</sup> antiqua illa et vera opponatur, quam a Christo per Apostolos accepit Ecclesia, atque in diuicatione tanta idonei defensores Scripturae sacrae exurgant.

Itaque ea prima sit cura, ut in sacris Seminariis vel Academiis sic omnino tradantur divinae Litterae, quemadmodum et ipsius gravitas disciplinae et temporum necessitas admonent. Cuius rei causa, nihil profecto debet esse antiquius magistrorum delectione prudenti: ad hoc enim munus non homines quidem de multis, sed tales assumi oportet, quos magnus amor et diuturna consuetudo Bibliorum, atque opportunus doctrinae ornatus commendabiles faciat, pares officio. Neque minus prospiciendum mature est, horum postea locum qui sint excepturi. Iuverit idcirco, ubi commodum sit, ex alumnis optimae spei, theologiae spatium laudate emensis, nonnullos divinis Libris totos addici, facta eisdem plenioris cuiusdam studii aliquandiu facultate. Ita delecti institutique doctores, commissum munus adeant fidenter: in quo ut versentur optime et consentaneos fructus educant, aliqua ipsis documenta paulo explicatius impertire placet. Ergo ingeniiis tironum in ipso studii limine sic

prospiciant, ut iudicium in eis, aptum pariter Libris divinis tuendis atque arripiendae ex ipsis sententiae, conforment sedulo et excolant. Huc pertinet tractatus *de introductione*, ut loquuntur, *biblica*, ex quo alumnus commodam habet opem ad integritatem auctoritatemque Bibliorum convincendam, ad legitimum in illis sensum investigandum et assequendum, ad occupanda captiosa et radicitus evellenda. Quae quanti momenti sit disposite scienterque, comite et adiutrice theologia, esse initio disputata, vix attinet dicere, quum tota continenter tractatio Scripturae reliqua hisce vel fundamentis nitatur vel luminibus clarescat. Exinde in fructuosiore huius doctrinae partem, quae de interpretatione est, perstudiose incumbet praeceptoris opera; sit unde auditoribus, quo dein modo divini verbi divitias in profectum religionis et pietatis convertant. Intellegimus equidem enarrari in scholis Scripturas omnes, nec per amplitudinem rei, nec per tempus licere. Verumtamen, quoniam certa opus est via interpretationis utiliter expediendae, utrumque magister prudens devitet incommodum, vel eorum qui de singulis libris cursim delibandum praebent, vel eorum qui in certa unius parte immoderatus consistunt. Si enim in plerisque scholis adeo non poterit obtineri, quod in Academiis maioribus, ut unus aut alter liber continuatione quadam et ubertate exponatur, at magnopere efficiendum est, ut librorum partes ad interpretandum selectae tractationem habeant convenienter plenam: quo veluti specimine allecti discipuli et edocti, cetera ipsi perlegant adamantque in omni vita. Is porro, retinens instituta maiorum, exemplar in hoc sumet versionem vulgatam; quam Concilium Tridentinum *in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica* habendam decrevit<sup>1</sup>, atque etiam commendat quotidiana Ecclesiae consuetudo. Neque tamen non sua habenda erit ratio reliquarum versionum, quas christiana laudavit usurpavitque antiquitas, maxime codicum primigeniorum. Quamvis enim, ad summam rei quod spectat, ex dictionibus

1 Sess. iv, *decr. de edit. et usu sacr. libror.*

Vulgatae hebraea et graeca bene eluceat sententia, attamen si quid ambigue, si quid minus accurate inibi elatum sit, "inspectio praecedentis linguae," suasore Augustino, proficiet<sup>1</sup>. Tamvero per se liquet, quam multum navitatis ad haec adhiberi oporteat, quum demum sit "commentatoris officium, non quid ipse velit, sed quid sentiat ille quem interpretetur, exponere<sup>2</sup>." Post expensam, ubi opus sit, omni industria lectionem, tum locus erit scrutandae et proponendae sententiae. Primum autem consilium est, ut probata communiter interpretandi praescripta tanto experrectiore observentur cura quanto morosior ab adversariis urget contentio. Propterea cum studio perpendendi quid ipsa verba valeant, quid consecutio rerum velit, quid locorum similitudo aut talia cetera, externa quoque appositae eruditionis illustratio societur; cauto tamen, ne istiusmodi quaestionibus plus temporis tribuatur et operae quam pernoscendis divinis Libris, neve corrogata multiplex rerum cognitio mentibus iuvenum plus incommodi afferat quam adiumenti. Ex hoc, tutus erit gradus ad usum divinae Scripturae in re theologica. Quo in genere animadvertisse oportet, ad ceteras difficultatis causas, quae in quibusvis antiquorum libris intelligendis fere occurrunt, proprias aliquas in Libris sacris accedere. Eorum enim verbis auctore Spiritu Sancto, res multae subiiciuntur quae humanae vim aciemque rationis longissime vincunt, divina scilicet mysteria et quae cum illis continentur alia multa; idque nonnunquam ampliore quadam et reconditiore sententia, quam exprimere littera et hermeneuticae leges indicare videantur: alios praeterea sensus, vel ad dogmata illustranda vel ad commendanda praecepta vitae, ipse litteralis sensus profecto adscisit. Quamobrem diffitendum non est religiosa quadam obscuritate sacros Libros involvi, ut ad eos, nisi aliquo viae duce, nemo ingredi possit:<sup>3</sup> Deo quidem sic providente (quae vulgata est opinio Ss. Patrum), ut homines maiore cum desiderio et studio illos perscrutarentur,

<sup>1</sup> *De doctr. chr.* iii, 4.

<sup>2</sup> S. Hier. ad Pammach.

<sup>3</sup> S. Hier. ad Paulin. *de studio Script. ep.* liii, 4.

resque inde operose perceptas mentibus animisque altius infigerent; intelligerentque praecipue, Scripturas Deum tradidisse Ecclesiae, qua scilicet duce et magistra in legendis tractandisque eloquiis suis certissima uterentur. Ubi enim charismata Domini posita sint, ibi discendam esse veritatem, atque ab illis, apud quos sit successio apostolica, Scripturas nullo cum periculo exponi, iam sanctus docuit Irenaeus:<sup>1</sup> cuius quidem ceterorumque Patrum doctrinam Synodus Vaticana amplexa est, quando Tridentinum decretum de divini verbi scripti interpretatione renovans, *hanc illius mentem esse declaravit, ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, is pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendus sit, 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 unanimum consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacrum interpretari.*<sup>2</sup> Qua plena sapientiae lege nequaquam Ecclesia pervestigationem scientiae biblicae retardat aut coërcet; sed eam potius ab errore integram praestat, plurimumque ad veram adiuvat progressionem. Nam privato cuique doctori magnus patet campus, in quo, tutis vestigiis, sua interpretandi industria praeclare certet Ecclesiaeque utiliter. In locis quidem divinae Scripturae qui expositionem certam et definitam adhuc desiderant, effici ita potest, ex suavi Dei providentis consilio, ut, quasi praeparato studio, iudicium Ecclesiae maturetur, in locis vero iam definitis potest privatus doctor aequè prodesse, si eos vel enucleatius apud fidelium plebem et ingeniosius apud doctos edisserat, vel insignius evincat ab adversariis. Quapropter praecipuum sanctumque sit catholico interpreti, ut illa Scripturae testimonia, quorum sensus authentice declaratus est, aut per sacros auctores, Spiritu Sancto afflante, uti multis in locis novi Testamenti, aut per Ecclesiam, eodem Sancto adsistente Spiritu, *sive solemni iudicio, sive ordinario et universati magisterio*<sup>3</sup>, eadem ipse ratione interpretetur

<sup>1</sup> *C. haer.* iv, 26 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Sess.* iii, *cap.* ii, *de revel.*; *cf.* Conc. Trid. *sess.* iv, *decr. de edit. et usu sacr. libror.*

<sup>3</sup> Conc. Vat. *sess.* iii, *cap.* iii, *de fide.*

atque ex adiumentis disciplinae suae convincat, eam solam interpretationem, ad sanae hermeneuticae leges, posse recte probari. In ceteris analogia fidei sequenda est, et doctrina catholica, qualis ex auctoritate Ecclesiae accepta, tanquam summa norma est adhibenda: nam, quum et sacrorum Librorum et doctrinae apud Ecclesiam depositae idem sit auctor Deus, profecto fieri nequit, ut sensus ex illis, qui ab hac quoquo modo discrepet, legitima interpretatione eruatur. Ex quo apparet, eam interpretationem ut ineptam et falsam reiiciendam, quae, vel inspiratos auctores inter se quodammodo pugnantes faciat, vel doctrinae Ecclesia adversetur. Huius igitur disciplinae magister hac etiam laude floreat oportet, ut omnem theologiam egregie teneat, atque in commentariis versatus sit Ss. Patrum Doctorumque et interpretum optimorum. Id sane inculcat Hieronymus<sup>1</sup>, multumque Augustinus, qui, iusta cum querela, “Si unaquaeque disciplina, inquit, quamquam vilis et facilis, ut percipi possit, doctorum aut magistrum requirit, quid temerariae superbiae plenius, quam divinorum sacramentorum libros ab interpretibus suis nolle cognoscere!”<sup>2</sup> Id ipsum sensere et exemplo confirmavere ceteri Patres, qui “divinarum Scripturarum intelligentiam, non ex propria praesumptione, sed ex maiorum scriptis et auctoritate sequebantur, quos et ipsos ex apostolica successione intelligendi regulam suscepisse constabat.”<sup>3</sup> Iamvero Ss. Patrum, quibus “post Apostolos, sancta Ecclesia plantatoribus, rigatoribus, aedicatoribus, pastoribus, nutritoribus crevit,”<sup>4</sup> summa auctoritas est, quotiescumque testimonium aliquod biblicum, ut ad fidei pertinens morumve doctrinam, uno eodemque modo explicant omnes: nam ex ipsa eorum consensione, ita ab Apostolis secundum catholicam fidem traditum esse nitide eminet. Eorundem vero Patrum sententia tunc etiam magni aestimanda est, quum hisce de rebus munere doctorum quasi privatim funguntur; quippe quos,

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 6, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ad Honorat. *de utilit. cred.* xvii, 35.

<sup>3</sup> Rufin. *Hist. eccl.* ii, 9.

<sup>4</sup> S. Aug. c. Iulian. ii, 10, 37.

non modo scientia revelatae doctrinae et multarum notitia rerum, ad apostolicos libros cognoscendos utilium, valde commendet, verum Deus ipse, viros sanctimonia vitae et veritatis studio insignes, amplioribus luminis sui praesidiis adiuverit. Quare interpret suum esse noverit, eorum et vestigia reverenter persequi et laboribus frui intelligenti delectu. Neque ideo tamen viam sibi putet obstructam, quo minus, ubi iusta causa adfuerit, inquirendo et exponendo vel ultra procedat, modo praeceptioni illi, ab Augustino sapienter propositae, religiose obsequatur, videlicet a litterali et veluti obvio sensu minime discedendum, nisi qua eum vel ratio tenere prohibeat vel necessitas cogat dimittere:<sup>1</sup> quae praeceptio eo tenenda est firmiter, quo magis, in tanta novitatum cupidine et opinionum licentia, periculum imminet aberrandi. Caveat idem ne illa negligat quae ab eisdem Patribus ad allegoricam similemve sententiam translata sunt, maxime quum ex litterali descendant et multorum auctoritate fulciantur. Talem enim interpretandi rationem ab Apostolis Ecclesia accepit, suoque ipsa exemplo, ut e re patet liturgica, comprobavit; non quod Patres ex ea contenderent dogmata fidei per se demonstrare, sed quia bene frugiferam virtuti et pietati alendae nosset experti. Ceterorum interpretum catholicorum est minor quidem auctoritas, attamen, quoniam Bibliorum studia continuum quemdam progressum in Ecclesia habuerunt, istorum pariter commentariis suis tribuendus est honor, ex quibus multa opportune peti liceat ad refellenda contraria, ad difficiliora enodanda. At vero id nimium dedecet, ut quis, egregiis operibus, quae nostri abunde reliquerunt, ignoratis aut despectis, heterodoxorum libros praeoptet, ab eisque cum praesenti sanae doctrinae periculo et non raro cum detrimento fidei, explicationem locorum quaerat in quibus catholici ingenia et labores suos iam dudum optimeque collocarint. Licet enim heterodoxorum studiis, prudenter adhibitis, iuvare interdum possit interpret catholicus, meminerit tamen, ex crebris quoque veterum documentis<sup>2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> *De Gen. ad litt.* l. viii, c. 7, 13.

<sup>2</sup> Cfr. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii 16; Orig. *de princ.* iv, 8; *in Levit. hom.* 4, 8; Tertull. *de praescr.* 15, *seqq.*; S. Hilar. Pict. *in Matth.* 13, 1.



incorruptum sacrarum Litterarum sensum extra Ecclesiam neutiquam reperiri, neque ab eis tradi posse, qui, verae fidei expertes, Scripturae, non medullam attingunt, sed corticem rodunt.<sup>1</sup>

Illud autem maxime optabile est et necessarium, ut eiusdem divinae Scripturae usus in universam theologiae influat disciplinam eiusque prope sit anima: ita nimirum omni aetate Patres atque praeclarissimi quique theologi professi sunt et re praestiterunt. Nam quae obiectum sunt fidei vel ab eo consequuntur, ex divinis potissime Litteris studuerunt asserere et stabilire; atque ex ipsis, sicut pariter ex divina traditione, nova haereticorum commenta refutare, catholicorum dogmatum rationem, intelligentiam, vincula exquirere. Neque id cuiquam fuerit mirum qui reputet, tam insignem locum inter revelationis fontes divinis Libris debere, ut, nisi eorum studio usque assiduo, nequeat theologia rite et pro dignitate tractari. Tametsi enim rectum est iuvenes in Academiis et scholis ita praecipue exerceri ut intellectum et scientiam dogmatum assequantur, ab articulis fidei argumentatione instituta ad alia ex illis, secundum normas probatae solidaeque philosophiae, concludenda; gravi tamen eruditoque theologo minime negligenda est ipsa demonstratio dogmatum ex Bibliorum auctoritatibus ducta: “Non enim accipit (theologia) sua principia ab aliis scientiis, sed immediate a Deo per revelationem. Et ideo non accipit ab aliis scientiis, tamquam a superioribus, sed utitur eis tamquam inferioribus et ancillis.” Quae sacrae doctrinae tradendae ratio praeceptorem commendatoremque habet theologorum principem, Aquinatem<sup>2</sup>: qui praeterea, ex hac bene perspecta christianae theologiae indole, docuit quemadmodum possit theologus sua ipsa principia, si qui ea forte impugnent, tueri: “Argumentando quidem, si adversarius aliquid concedat eorum, quae per divinam revelationem habentur; sicut per auctoritates sacrae Scripturae disputamus contra haereticos, et per unum articulum contra negantes alium. Si vero adversarius nihil credat eorum

1 S. Greg. M. *Moral.* xx, 9 (al. 11).

2 *Summ. theol.* p. 1, q. 1, a. 5 ad 2.

quae divinitus revelantur, non remanet amplius via ad probandum articulos fidei per rationes, sed ad solvendum rationes si quas inducit contra fidem.”<sup>1</sup> Providendum igitur, ut ad studia biblica convenienter instructi nuntique aggrediantur iuvenes; ne iustam frustrentur spem, neu, quod deterius est, erroris discrimen incaute subeant, Rationalistarum capti fallaciis apparatusque specie eruditionis. Erunt autem optime comparati, si, quâ Nosmetipsi monstravimus et praescipsimus via, philosophiae et theologiae institutionem, eodem S. Thoma duce, religiose coluerint penitusque perceperint. Ita recte incedent, quum in re biblica, tum in ea theologiae parte quam *positivam* nominant, in utraque laetissime progressuri.

Doctrinam catholicam legitima et solerti sacrorum Bibliorum interpretatione probasse, exposuisse, illustrasse, multum id quidem est: altera tamen, eaque tam gravis momenti quam operis laboriosi, pars remanet, ut ipsorum auctoritas integra quam validissime asseratur. Quod quidem nullo alio pacto plene licebit universeque assequi, nisi ex vivo et proprio magisterio Ecclesiae; quae *per se ipsa, ob suam nempe admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus bonis fecunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum est motivum credibilitatis et divinae suae legationis testimonium irrefragabile.*<sup>2</sup> Quoniam vero divinum et infallibile magisterium Ecclesiae, in auctoritate etiam sacrae Scripturae consistit, huius propterea fides saltem humana asserenda in primis vindicandaque est; quibus ex libris, tanquam ex antiquitatis probatissimis testibus, Christi Domini divinitas et legatio, Ecclesiae hierarchicae institutio, primatus Petro et successoribus eius collatus, in tuto apertoque collocentur. Ad hoc plurimum sane conducet, si plures sint e sacro ordine paratiores, qui hac etiam in parte pro fide dimicent et impetus hostiles propulsent, induti praecipue armatura Dei, quam suadet Apostolus,<sup>3</sup> neque vero ad

1 *Ibid.* a. 8.

2 Conc. Vat. *sess.* iii c. in. *de fide.*

3 Eph. vi, 13, *seqq.*

nova hostium arma et praelia insueti. Quod pulcre in sacerdotum officiis sic recenset Chrysostomus; "Ingens adhibendum est studium ut *Christi verbum habitet in nobis abundanter*<sup>1</sup>; neque enim ad unum pugnae genus parati esse debemus, sed multiplex est bellem et varii sunt hostes; neque iisdem omnes utuntur armis, neque uno tautum modo nobiscum congressuri moliuntur. Quare opus est, ut is qui cum omnibus congressurus est, omnium machinas artesque cognititas habeat, ut idem sit sagittarius et funditor, tribunus et manipuli dux, dux et miles, pedes et eques, navalis ac muralis pugnae peritus; nisi enim omnes dimicandi artes noverit, novit diabolus per unam partem, si sola negligatur, praedonibus suis immissis, oves diripere<sup>2</sup>. "Fallacias hostium artesque in hac re ad impugnandum multiplices supra adumbravimus: iam, quibus praesidiis ad defensionem nitendum, commoneamus. Est primum in studio linguarum veterum orientalium simulque in arte quam vocant criticam. Utriusque rei scientia quam hodie in magno sit pretio et laude, eâ clerus, plus minusve pro locis et hominibus exquisita, ornatus, melius poterit decus et munus sustinere suum; nam ipse *omnia omnibus*<sup>3</sup> fieri debet, paratus semper *ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de ea quae in ipso est spe*<sup>4</sup>. Ergo sacrae Scripturae magistris necesse est atque theologo addecet, eas linguas cognititas habere quibus libri canonici sunt primitus ab hagiographis exarati, easdemque optimum factu erit si colant alumni Ecclesiae, qui praesertim ad academicos theologiae gradus aspirant. Atque etiam curandum ut omnibus in Academiis, quod iam in multis receptum laudabiliter est, de ceteris item antiquis linguis, maxime semiticis, deque congruente cum illis eruditione, sint magisteria, eorum in primis usui qui ad sacras Litteras profitendas designantur. Hos autem ipsos, eiusdem rei gratiâ, doctiores esse oportet atque exercitiores in vera artis criticae disciplina: perperam enim et cum religionis damno inductum est artificium, nomine honestatum criticae sublimioris, quo, ex

1 *Cfr.* Col. iii, 16.

2 *De sacerdotibus.* iv, 4.

3 I Cor. ix, 22.

4 I Petr. iii, 15.

solis internis, uti loquuntur, rationibus, cuiuspiam libri origo, integritas, auctoritas diiudicata emergant. Contra perspicuum est, in quaestionibus rei historicae, cuiusmodi origo et conservatio librorum, historiae testimonia valere prae ceteris, eaque esse quam studiosissime et conquirenda et excutienda: illas vero rationes internas plerumque non esse tanti, ut in causam, nisi ad quamdam confirmationem, possint advocari. Secus si fiat, magna profecto consequentur incommoda. Nam hostibus religionis plus confidentiae futurum est ut sacrorum authenticitatem Librorum impetant et discerpant: illud ipsum quod extollunt genus criticae sublimioris, eo demum recidet, ut suum quisque studium praeiudicatamque opinionem interpretando sectentur: inde neque Scripturis quaesitum lumen accedet, neque ulla doctrinae oritura utilitas est sed certa illa patebit erroris nota, quae est varietas et dissimilitudo sentiendi, ut iam ipsi sunt documento huiusce novae principes disciplinae: inde etiam, quia plerique infecti sunt vanae philosophiae et rationalismi placitis ideo prophetias, miracula, cetera quaecumque naturae ordinem superent, ex sacris Libris dimovere non verebuntur. Congrediendum secundo loco cum iis, qui suâ physicorum scientia abusi, sacros Libros omnibus vestigiis indagant, unde auctoribus inscitiam rerum talium opponant, scripta ipsa vituperent. Quae quidem insimulationes quum res attingant sensibus obiectas, eo periculosiores accidunt, manantes in vulgus, maxime in deditam litteris iuventutem; quae, semel reverentiam divinae revelationis in uno aliquo capite exuerit, facile in omnibus omnem eius fidem est dimissura. Nimium sane constat, de natura doctrinam, quantum ad percipiendam summi Artificis gloriam in procreatis rebus impressam aptissima est, modo sit convenienter proposita, tantum posse ad elementa sanae philosophiae evellenda corrumpendosque mores, teneris animis perverse infusam. Quapropter Scripturae sacrae doctori cognitio naturalium rerum bono erit subsidio, quo huius quoque modi captiones in divinos Libros instructas facilius detegat et refellat. Nulla quidem theologum inter et physicum vera dissensio intercesserit, dum suis uterque finibus se contineant, id caventes, secundum S. Augustini monitum, "ne aliquid

temere et incognitum pro cognito asserant.”<sup>1</sup> Sin tamen dissenserint, quemadmodum se gerat theologus, summam est regula ab eodem oblata: “Quidquid, inquit, ipsi de natura rerum veracibus documentis demonstrare potuerint, ostendamus nostris Litteris non esse contrarium; quidquid autem de quibuslibet suis voluminibus his nostris Litteris, idest catholicae fidei, contrarium protulerint, aut aliqua etiam facultate ostendamus, aut nulla dubitatione credamus esse falsissimum.”<sup>2</sup> De cuius aequitate regulae in consideratione sit primum, scriptores sacros, seu verius “Spiritum Dei, qui per ipsos loquebatur, noluisse ista (videlicet intimam adspectabilium rerum constitutionem) docere homines, nulli saluti profutura:”<sup>3</sup> quare eos, potius quam explorationem naturae recta persequantur, res ipsas aliquando describere et tractare aut quodam translationis modo, aut sicut communis sermo per ea ferebat tempora, hodieque de multis fert rebus in quotidiana vita, ipsos inter homines scientissimos. Vulgari autem sermone quum ea primo proprieque efferantur quae cadant sub sensus, non dissimiliter scriptor sacer (monuitque et Doctor Angelicus) “ea secutus est, quae sensibilibus apparent,”<sup>4</sup> seu quae Deus ipse, homines alloquens, ad eorum captum significavit humano more. Quod vero defensio Scripturae sanctae agenda strenue est, non ex eo omnes aequae sententiae tuendae sunt, quas singuli Patres aut qui deinceps interpretes in eadem declaranda ediderint: qui, prout erant opiniones aetatis, in locis edisserendis ubi physica aguntur, fortasse non ita semper iudicaverunt ex veritate, ut quaedam posuerint, quae nunc minus probentur. Quocirca studiose dignoscendum in illorum interpretationibus, quaenam reapse tradant tamquam spectantia ad fidem aut cum ea maxime copulata, quaenam unanimes tradant consensu; namque “in his quae de necessitate fidei non sunt, licuit Sanctis diversimode opinari, sicut et nobis,” ut est S. Thomae sententia.<sup>5</sup> Qui et alio loco prudentissime habet:

1 *In Gen. op. imperf.* ix, 30.

2 *De Gen. ad litt.* i, 21, 41.

3 S. Aug. *ib.* ii, 9, 20.

4 *Summa theol.* p. i. q. lxx, a. 1 ad 3.

5 *In Sent.* ii, dist. ii, q. 1, a. 3.

“Mihi videtur tutius esse, huiusmodi, quae philosophi communiter senserunt, et nostrae fidei non repugnant, nec sic esse asserenda ut dogmata fidei, etsi aliquando sub nomine philosophorum introducantur, nec sic esse neganda tamquam fidei contraria, ne sapientibus huius mundi occasio contemnendi doctrinam fidei preabeatur.”<sup>1</sup> Sane, quamquam ea, quae speculatores naturae certis argumentis certa iam esse affirmarint, interpretes ostendere debet nihil Scripturis recte explicatis obsistere, ipsum tamen ue fugiat, factum quandoque esse, ut certa quaedam ab illis tradita, postea in dubitationem adducta sint et repudiata. Quod si physicorum scriptores terminos disciplinae suae transgressi, in provinciam philosophorum perversitate opinionum invadant, eas interpretes theologus philosophis mittat refutandas. Haec ipsa deinde ad cognatas disciplinas, ad historiam praesertim, iuvabit transferri. Dolendum enim, multos esse qui antiquitatis monumenta, gentium mores et instituta, similibusque rerum testimonia magnis ii quidem laboribus perscrutentur et proferant, sed eo saepius consilio, ut erroris labes in sacris Libris deprehendant, ex quo illorum auctoritas usquequaque infirmetur et nudet. Idque nonnulli et nimis infesto animo faciunt nec satis aequo iudicio; qui sic dant profanis libris et documentis memoriae priscae, perinde ut nulla eis ne suspicio quidem erroris possit subesse, libris vero Scripturae sacrae, ex opinata tantum erroris specie, neque eâ probe discussa, vel parem abnuunt fidem. Fieri quidem potest, ut quaedam librariis in codicibus describendis minus recte exciderint; quod considerate indicandum est, nec facile admittendum, nisi quibus locis rite sit demonstratum: fieri etiam potest, ut germana alicuius loci sententia permaneat anceps; cui enodandae multum afferent optimae interpretandi regulae: at nefas omnino fuerit, aut inspirationem ad aliquas tantum sacrae Scripturae partes coangustare, aut concedere sacrum ipsum errasse auctorem. Nec enim toleranda est eorum ratio, qui ex istis difficultatibus sese expediunt, id nimirum dare non dubitantes, inspirationem divinam ad res

fidei morumque, nihil praeterea, petinere, eo quod falso arbitrentur, de veritate sententiarum quum agitur, non adeo exquirendum quatenus dixerit Deus, ut non magis perpendatur quam ob causam ea dixerit. Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quos Ecclesia tamquam sacros et canonicos recipit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dictante, conscripti sunt: tantum vero abest ut divinae inspirationi error ullus subesse possit, ut ea per se ipsa, non modo errorem excludat omnem, sed tam necessario excludat et respuat, quam necessarium est, Deum, summam Veritatem, nullius omnino erroris auctorem esse. Haec est antiqua et constans fides Ecclesiae, solemniter etiam sententia in Conciliis definita Florentino et Tridentino; confirmata denique atque expressius declarata in Concilio Vaticano, a quo absolute edictum: *Veteris et novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in eiusdem Concilii (Tridentini) decreta recensentur, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem.*<sup>1</sup> Quare nihil admodum refert, Spiritum Sanctum assumpsisse homines tamquam instrumenta ad scribendum, quasi, non quidem primario auctori, sed scriptoribus inspiratis quidpiam falsi elabi potuerit. Nam supernaturali ipse virtute ita eos ad scribendum excitavit et movit, ita scribentibus adstitit, ut ea omnia eaque sola quae ipse juberet, et recte mente conciperent, et fideliter conscribere vellent, et apte infallibili veritate exprimerent: secus, non ipse esset auctor sacrae Scripturae universae. Hoc ratum semper habuere Ss. Patres: "Itaque, ait Augustinus, quum illi scripserunt quae ille ostendit et dixit, nequaquam dicendum est, quod ipse non scripserit: quandoquidem membra eius id operata sunt, quod dictante capite cognoverunt:"<sup>2</sup> pronunciatque S. Gregorius M.: "Quis haec scripserit, valde supervacaneae quaeritur, quum

1 Sess. iii, c. ii, de revel.

2 De consensu Evangel. l, i, c. 35.

tamen auctor libri Spiritus Sanctus fideliter credatur. Ipse igitur haec scripsit qui scribenda dictavit : ipse scripsit qui et in illius opere inspirator extitit.<sup>1</sup>” Consequitur, ut qui in locis authenticis Librorum sacrorum quidpiam falsi contineri posse existiment, ii profecto aut catholicam divinae inspirationis notionem pervertant, aut Deum ipsum erroris faciant auctorem. Atque adeo Patribus omnibus et Doctoribus persuasissimum fuit, divinas Litteras, quales ab hagiographis editae sunt, ab omni omnino errore esse immunes, ut propterea non pauca illa, quae contrarii aliquid vel dissimile viderentur afferre (eademque fere sunt quae nomine novae scientiae nunc obiiciunt), non subtiliter minus quam religiose componere inter se et conciliare studuerint ; professi unanimes, Libros eos et integros et per partes a divino aequae esse afflatu, Deumque ipsum per sacros auctores elocutum nihil admodum a veritate alienum ponere potuisse. Ea valeant universe quae idem Augustinus ad Hieronymum scripsit : “ Ego enim fateor caritati tuae, solis eis Scripturarum libris qui iam canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorum scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam. Ac si aliquid in eis offendero litteris quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud quam vel mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse quod dictum est, vel me minime intellexisse non ambigam.”<sup>2</sup>

At vero omni graviorum artium instrumento pro sanctitate Bibliorum plene perfecteque contendere, multo id maius est, quam ut a sola interpretum et theologorum sollertia aequum sit expectari. Eodem optandum est conspirent et conmitantur illi etiam ex catholicis viris, qui ab externis doctrinis aliquam sint nominis auctoritatem adepti. Horum sane ingeniorum ornatus, si nunquam antea, ne nunc quidem, Dei beneficio, Ecclesiae deest ; atque utinam, eo amplius in fidei subsidium augeat. Nihil enim magis oportere ducimus, quam ut plures validioresque nanciscatur veritas propugnatores, quam sentiant adversarios ; neque res ulla est quae magis persuadere

1 *Praef. in Iob*, n. 2.

2 *Epistola lxxxii*, 1, et crebrius alibi.



vulgo possit obsequium veritatis, quam si eam liberrime profiteantur qui in laudata aliqua praestent facultate. Quin facile etiam cessura est obtrectatorum invidia, aut certe non ita petulanter iam traducere illi audebunt inimicam scientiae, fidem, quum viderint a viris scientiae laude nobilibus summum fidei honorem reverentiamque adhiberi. Quoniam igitur tantum ii possunt religioni importare commodi, quibus cum catholicae professionis gratia felicem indolem ingenii benignum Numen impertiit, ideo in hac acerrima agitatione studiorum quae Scripturas quoquo modo attingunt, aptum sibi quisque eligant studii genus, in quo aliquando excellentes, obiecta in illas improbae scientiae tela, non sine gloria, repellant. Quo loco gratum est illud pro merito comprobare nonnullorum catholicorum consilium, qui ut viris doctioribus suppetere possit unde huiusmodi studia omni adiumentorum copia pertractent et provehant, coactis societatibus, largiter pecunias solent conferre. Optima sane et peropportuna temporibus pecuniae collocandae ratio. Quo enim catholicis minus praesidii in sua studia sperare licet publice, eo promptiorem effusiolemque patere docet privatorum liberalitatem; ut quibus a Deo aucti sunt divitiis, eas ad tutandum revelatae ipsius doctrinae thesaurum velint convertere. Tales autem labores ut ad rem biblicam vere proficiant, insistant eruditi in iis tanquam principiis, quae supra a Nobis praefinita sunt; fideliterque teneant, Deum, conditorem rectoremque rerum omnium, eundem esse Scripturarum auctorem: nihil propterea ex rerum natura, nihil ex historiae monumentis colligi posse quod cum Scripturis revera pugnet. Si quid ergo tale videatur, id sedulo submovendum, tum adhibito prudenti theologorum et interpretum iudicio, quidnam verius verisimiliusve habeat Scripturae locus, de quo disceptetur, tum diligentius expensa argumentorum vi, quae contra adducantur. Neque ideo cessandum, si qua in contrarium species etiam tum resideat; nam, quoniam verum vero adversari haudquam potest, certum sit aut in sacrorum interpretationem verborum, aut in alteram disputationis partem errorem incurrisse: neutrum vero si necdum satis appareat cunctandum interea de sententia. Permulta enim ex omni doctrinarum

genere sunt diu multumque contra Scripturam iactata, quae nunc utpote inania, penitus obsolescere : item non pauca de quibusdam Scripturae locis (non proprie ad fidei morumque pertinentibus regulam) sunt quondam interpretando proposita, in quibus rectius postea vidit acrior quaedam investigatio. Nempe opinionum commenta delet dies ; sed " veritas manet et inaelescit in aeternum." <sup>1</sup> Quare, sicut nemo sibi arrogaverit ut omnem recte intelligat Scripturam, in qua se ipse plura nescire quam scire fassus et Augustinus, <sup>2</sup> ita, si quid inciderit difficilius quam explicari possit, quisque eam sumet cautionem temperationemque eiusdem Doctoris : " Melius est vel premi incognitis sed utilibus signis, quam inutiliter ea interpretando, a iugo servitutis eductam cervicem laqueis erroris inserere." <sup>3</sup> Consilia et iussa Nostra si probe verecundeque erunt secuti qui subsidiaria haec studia profitentur, si et scribendo et docendo studiorum fructus dirigant ad hostes veritatis redarguendos, ad fidei damna in iuventute praecavenda, tum demum laetari poterunt dignâ se opera sacris Litteris inservire, eamque rei catholicae opem afferre, qualem de filiorum pietate et doctrinis iure sibi Ecclesia pollicetur.

Haec sunt, Venerabiles Fratres, quae de studiis Scripturae sacrae pro opportunitate monenda et praecipienda, aspirante Deo, censuimus. Iam sit vestrum curare, ut qua par est religione custodiantur et observentur : sic ut debita Deo gratia, de communicatis humano generi eloquiis sapientiae suae, testatius eniteat, optataeque utilitates redundant, maxime ad sacrae iuventutis institutionem, quae tanta est cura Nostra et spes Ecclesiae. Auctoritate nimirum et hortatione date alacres operam, ut in Seminariis, atque in Academiis quae parent ditioni vestrae, haec studia iusto in honore consistant vigeantque. Integre feliciterque vigeant, moderatrice Ecclesia, secundum saluberrima documenta et exempla Ss. Patrum laudatamque maiorum consuetudinem : atque talia ex temporum cursu incrementa accipiant quae

<sup>1</sup> III. Esdr. 4, 38.

<sup>2</sup> Ad Ianuar. ep. lv. 21.

<sup>3</sup> De doct. chr. iii, 9, 18.

vere sint in praesidium et gloriam catholicae veritatis, natae divinitus ad perennem populorem salutem. Omnes denique alumnos et administros Ecclesiae paterna caritate admoneamus, ut ad sacras Litterae adeant summo semper affectu reverentiae et pietatis: nequaquam enim ipsarum intelligentia salutariter ut opus est patere potest, nisi remotâ scientiae *terrenae* arrogantia, studioque sancte excitato eius *quae desursum est* sapientiae. Cuius in disciplinam semel admissa mens, atque inde illustrata et roborata, mire valebit ut etiam humanae scientiae quae sunt fraudes dignoscat et vitet, qui sunt solidi fructus percipiat et ad aeterna referat: inde potissime exardescens animus, ad emolumenta virtutis et divini amoris spiritu vehementiore contendet: *Beati qui scrutantur testimonia eius, in toto corde exquirunt eum.*<sup>1</sup>

Iam divini auxilii spe freti et pastorali studia vestro confisi, Apostolicam benedictionem, caelestium munerum auspicem Nostraeque singularis benevolentiae testem, vobis omnibus, universoque Clero et populo singulis concredito, peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XVIII novembris anno MDCCCXCIII, Pontificatus Nostri sextodecimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

---

## THE ENCYCLICAL "PROVIDENTISSIMUS DEUS"

AND THE PROFESSORS OF SACRED SCRIPTURE IN OUR SEMINARIES.

### I.

THE last Encyclical of Leo XIII. directs attention to the study of the Sacred Scriptures. The Holy Father addresses himself primarily to the clergy, and in particular to the professors of Exegesis in the theological schools. "Optamus et cupimus," he says, "ut . . . illi potissime, quos divina gratia in sacrum ordinem vocavit, majorem in

1 Ps. xviii, 2.

dies diligentiam industriamque iis (*i. e.* S. Scripturis) legendis, meditandis, explanandis, quod aequissimum est, impendant." He points out, on the one hand, the utility of this study, and, on the other, the danger and loss, intellectually and morally, of its neglect. In strong and complete outline he sketches the historical development of biblical studies in the Church, and then proceeds to lay down definite principles and rules to be observed in teaching the Sacred Science in seminaries where students are trained for the Christian ministry.

It may be asked: Has there existed hitherto no provision in our theological curriculum for the systematic study of the Holy Scriptures? If so, what new thing does the Encyclical enjoin?

The Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" enjoins no new duty, but new reasons for an old and presently urgent duty. If the study of the Sacred Scriptures has ever been of primary importance as one of the two mainstays of Catholic doctrine, it claims for the time exceptional attention.

There are reasons for this, some arising from within and some from without the Church, which must be briefly touched upon, in order that the full significance of the recent pontifical document may be understood.

## II.

The position of the Bible in the economy of divine revelation is plain in the light of its history. As an element of appeal to the religious convictions of mankind, it belongs to the highest order; but it does not hold the first place. All but its prophecies are a written record of truths and facts, laws and precepts given and known to man previous to and independently of their commemoration in tablet or volume. How far the accidents, which impair the integrity of all such records, and cast a doubt upon their authenticity, have affected the Sacred Scriptures is evident from the divergent and often antagonistic readings and creeds to which they have given rise. If the medium of writing was intended to communicate to man truths, which his mind could not attain

in other ways, and if assent to these truths was to be a condition to the accomplishment of an end, without which man was a failure for which he himself must bear the penalty, then it stands to reason that so important a document should speak to us in unmistakably clear terms, at least as to the essential meaning of its precepts. Yet this not only is not the fact, but it is an impossibility, considering that the language of the Bible lacks intrinsic adaptability to the changes of time and character, which make it valuable to each successive generation only so far as it is capable of exact translation. We do not, of course, mean to insinuate that its principles and lessons are not sure and true, but to make their infallible truth a certain sign to changeable man, they need for their interpretation a living, directing influence, equally universal in authority and equally accessible to every age and nation. With such a living voice to elucidate the obscurities, the apparent inconsistencies and contradictions of the Sacred Books, and to bring them into harmony with the faith in which our forefathers lived peacefully and died approved in the Lord, the Bible admirably fulfils its purpose of silent witness to the truth. As an accessory and confirmatory source of revelation the literal text of the Bible permits a wider sense than private interpretation would allow it; whilst its very obscurity gives scope to individual devotion, in the reflection on God's manifold relations to man, in which exercise of the soul the mind is checked, by defined doctrine, from following the vagaries of self-love, or the tendency of mere speculation. No, God could never have intended man to be primarily guided by a criterion, which necessarily depends for its completeness on some living intelligence, and which is subject to the thousand vicissitudes of a purely material instrument.

What we have said, without depreciation of the secondary position of the Sacred Text as a channel of divine truth, is intended to show whence the danger of a neglect of its study arises in the case of Catholics. The Bible is the voice of God committed to writing. It is one of the ways in which the living voice of God reaches us, but not the only way, nor

by itself, the most reliable one. If truth, in order to be truth, must needs be infallible, then we may look to the Church, which Christ established as the authoritative school of that truth, as infallible. In its teaching we feel secure, all the more when we know that the written record, religiously preserved by many peoples through many ages, echoes that teaching. The study of the Sacred Scriptures, therefore, placed in the front rank of studies in the theological curriculum, has never been considered as of that exclusive importance which those attach to it who make the Bible the sole source and rule of their faith. In the Catholic system a well-authenticated tradition guarded by the divinely ruled High Priests who are the successors of St. Peter, ranks on equal terms with the Sacred Scriptures.

But peculiar circumstances give to the study of the Bible, as an occasion for doctrinal and moral revival, particular prominence and importance. These circumstances may be reduced to four heads. First, there is a gradual and general weakening of the principle of authority, as distinguished from the purely democratic system of rule by the majority. This fact, whilst it has made the declaration of papal infallibility both opportune and necessary in our times, has also lessened respect for the rulings of the individual representatives of authority. In such cases it is natural to lay more than ordinary stress upon the written law, both as a justification of right rule, and as a defence against personal grievance. A second factor which operates to give exceptional importance to the study of the Sacred Scriptures is a lowering of the estimate of tradition, when it lacks the evidence of tangible or documentary proof. As an historical monument the Bible can hold its own against the intellectual iconoclasm of those who have no respect for what has been, except in so far as it still is. If men refuse to accept tradition in general, we have all the more reason to hold on to the records which establish not only a claim to supernatural inspiration, but show a clear title of greater antiquity, as a whole, than any history of individual nations or races. The third circumstance compelling special attention to the study of the

Bible is the constantly growing intercourse of Catholics with religious minded non-Catholics who, amid the weird forebodings of social dissolution through general skepticism, seek in the Bible convincing reason for that obedience and reverence which is the sole guarantee of order, and which promoted among their forefathers personal happiness, domestic peace and national prosperity. Thus the study of the Bible, among what might be called evangelical Christians outside of the Catholic Church, has been cultivated of recent years with more zeal and attention to detail, if not to a larger degree, than formerly. Protestant biblical literature gives ample evidence of this activity. Herein lies a further reason for arousing Catholic teachers to a similar pursuit; for, although we might be no less sure of our religious faith without the Bible, we cannot ignore the principle of charity which urges us to give unto all a reason for the faith which is in us. If we would speak intelligibly and with no prejudice hindering our voice from reaching the heart of our non-Catholic brethren, we must meet them with a language familiar to their religious sense, and whose tones they implicitly trust as those of an instrument attuned to a heavenly harmony.

But while the religious mind clings to the Sacred Scriptures as an argument and stronghold against moral and intellectual anarchy, the opposition seeks out that same citadel for its attacks. Rationalism makes use of every weapon at its command to inveigh against the consistency, antiquity and truthfulness of the Sacred Text. History and science, sophistry, invention and ridicule are made to serve the cause of destruction, in a way never so rampant before. Under these circumstances it behooves the Catholic teacher and apologist to assume similar weapons in defence of the grand edifice of Catholic doctrine, reared under the inspiration of God to be a defence of truth. And this fact furnishes the most powerful reason for cultivating a thorough study of the Sacred Text.

To such purpose the Holy Father enlarges upon the requirements for the proper teaching of Sacred Scripture in

our seminaries, and outlines the method of inculcating this presently all important science upon the minds of candidates of the holy ministry, who are to lead in the warfare threatening the religion of Christ. "Qui sacrarum Scripturarum testimoniis roboratus est, is est propugnaculum Christi."—*Hieron.*

### III.

The duties exacted, under present circumstances, of the professor of Sacred Scriptures are of such a nature as to require a rare combination of talent and devotedness. "Nothing," to use the words of the Sovereign Pontiff, "is more important than the right choice of teachers in this department."<sup>1</sup> They are to be possessed of a marked love for the reading of the Sacred Text and thoroughly familiar with its sentiments and history. Nor this alone. They are to be men of general culture, well informed and rightly balanced minds that can judge properly of the meaning and bearing of the incidents and principles set forth in the Bible, so as to apply them to things present and practical. This practical view the Holy Father insists upon with a singular emphasis. Hence he suggests that the professor make choice of certain portions of the Sacred Text for his explanations rather than seek to cover the entire ground, which could be done only superficially in the time ordinarily allowed for this discipline in the ecclesiastical curriculum. The object is to create a taste for the study of the Bible, to indicate a right system of pursuing it, and to make the student familiar with the reliable sources in literature whence he may draw aid for completely mastering the wondrous stores of knowledge and moral strength contained in the Sacred Writings.

The Council of Baltimore<sup>2</sup> gives some directions for forming a plan of studies in Sacred Scripture. According to it, ecclesiastical students are to attend a class of "Introduction,"

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Encyclic. passus incipiens *Itaque ea prima sit*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Plen. Balt. III n. 171.



in which the authenticity and canonical authority of the different books is to be examined, and the hermeneutical rules for right interpretation of the text are to be mastered. The purpose to be kept in view is to equip the mind of the students with certain preparatory knowledge for the reading of the Bible itself, and to open their sense to the perception of those treasures which the priest may utilize in his ministry as religious teacher, preacher and catechist. The Council likewise suggests the teaching of at least one year's Hebrew, as an almost essential requisite for the intelligent study of the Bible.

But Leo XIII goes much farther. He desires that not only students of exceptional talent be selected by the professors to become specialists in biblical science, and that after having finished their regular course in theology they be given further opportunity for such studies under able masters, but he would have scriptural studies as a whole assume a more critical character, though withal practical. Indeed, he warns against that excessive pursuit of the science purely as such, which spends the energies and resources of the studious mind in wrangling about details of no moment. "*Propterea cum studio perpendendi quid ipsa verba valeant, quid consecutio verbo um valet, quid locorum similitudo aut talia caetera, externa quoque appositae eruditionis illustratio societur; cauto tamen, ne istiusmodi quaestionibus plus temporis tribuatur et operae quam pernoscendis divinis Libris, neve corrogata multiplex rerum cognitio mentibus juvenum plus incommodi afferat quam adjumenti.*"

This is surely an important restriction. Many a clever and studious youth who has attended the lectures of learned masters has gained little or nothing, because of the excess of scientific research into details. The time that can be devoted to the study of the Sacred Scripture in the seminary is far too short to allow of more than a cursory following out of ordinary text-books on "Introduction," with but a limited practice in Exegesis. In every case the professor has much to do by way of selecting and supplementing such works as may serve him for text in his class. We have, indeed

excellent manuals of "Introduction" in Latin, French and German. In English hand-books, by Catholic authors, we are deficient. As the class of "Introduction" is to be taught, if possible, before the student enters his theology course, a Latin text-book is not practicable, unless the teacher take unusual pains and have repetitions of his class several times a week. Let us see what can be done under ordinary circumstances. We assume that the Overbrook course of studies, modeled on the whole upon the plan of the Baltimore Council, offers a fair estimate of what the student may be expected to accomplish, under the American system of education. He is expected to make a course of two years' philosophy and four years' theology. In the class of logic, during the first of these six years, all his attention is claimed by the principal branch in mental philosophy, besides the supplementary classes of higher mathematics, physics, scriptural Greek, and some of the modern languages, which are almost essential for his subsequent reading in the higher sciences. The following year, with metaphysics and ethics as principal studies, he has to attend Hebrew and general introduction to Sacred Scripture. Allowing two hours a week for the latter study, there are some seventy hours, not including examinations, in which the whole field of biblical inspiration, hermeneutics proper, and the geography, the domestic, social, political and religious history, together with the result of archæological research bearing on these subjects, is to be mastered. This surely requires careful selection of topics by the professor, and the best possible use of the time with his students.

In the four succeeding years of theology the professor of exegesis might deal with select subjects, but he could never go over the entire volume of the Sacred Scriptures with any attempt at fruitful teaching. The parts which naturally suggest themselves as requiring the special attention of the theological student are Genesis, or rather the Pentateuch, and the Psalms, in the Old Testament; the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, in the New Testament. One year given to each of these parts is barely capable of imbuing the student,

with an appreciation of the value, for his ministerial work, of the inspired books, on the one hand, and with the difficulties which an endeavor of their just interpretation presents, on the other. Here, too, the little that can be done cannot be done well unless by the laborious assistance of a skillful tutor, who knows how to save his students the burden of memorizing much, and who can rivet their attention to a multitude of essential and useful facts, by an interesting method of condensing knowledge. He is, moreover, to teach his pupils the use of critical weapons against a false science and a liberal religion. And here we touch upon another important point suggested in the Encyclical.

Those who have been overanxious to observe the traditional interpretations of the old exegetes, in every case of obscure or unintelligible passages, may be induced to widen their scope of biblical intelligence and temper their criticism of those who venture to suggest other views more in harmony with now established facts of history or science, even though they may be unpopular. "Diffitendum non est religiosa quadam obscuritate sacros Libros involvi, ut ad eos, nisi aliquo viae duce, nemo ingredi possit. . . privato cuique doctori magnus patet campus, in quo, tutis vestigiis, sua interpretandi industriâ praeclare certet, Ecclesiaeque utiliter." There are many things in the sacred volume which admit of free discussion within the proper limits of orthodoxy, as well as good sense and feeling. To these the attention of the student must be called with perfect frankness, which need not in the least disarm his confidence in the inspired character of the sacred records. In all cases where the doctrine of the Church is not involved, a reasonable doubt of the correct sense of a passage must be met with considerateness on the part of the exegete, despite preconceived notions which cannot stand the test of experience or logical reason. But the perception of right reason and the estimate of experience are relative terms, and we may well be slow in committing ourselves absolutely to one sense or other, where grave men differ. A safe norm of interpretation, where defined doctrine is not in question, is the analogy of faith. And in this the writings of the Christian

Fathers and the old commentators prove a deep and reliable source of study to the biblical scholar. The fact that we do not understand a passage, or that it does not accommodate itself to our sense of fitness or probability, is certainly no argument why we should reject the interpretation of the literal sense. Often, too, the spirit of prophecy invests a passage with an allegorical character which only a familiarity with its theological or historical counterpart could make intelligible to the student. All this goes to show, what the Holy Father insists upon at some length, namely, that the opinions of the Fathers of the Church are not to be lightly set aside, but rather primarily considered in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.

To meet the current objections of men who seek to establish an evidence of contradiction between science and revealed religion, familiarity with the data of science is an essential condition. Not only does mere assertion of the meaning of a text have no weight with educated men, when it exhibits a lack of knowledge or respect for the assumptions, not to speak of the facts of science, but it lowers their estimate of the whole system of religious teaching and gives color to the common belief that Catholic dogma takes no account of reason. To this field too the professor of the Sacred Scriptures is, therefore, to direct the attention of his pupils in a way which gives them the confidence of knowledge.

It is evident from the desultory suggestions we have made, how very wide the field is which the theological student has to cross, in order to enable him to make proper use of his studies of the Bible. Yet it is most desirable that every opportunity be given him to go over it in all its essential features. A thorough study of the Sacred Scriptures is the very best schooling in moral and dogmatic theology. "*Optabile est et necessarium ut ejusdem divinae Scripturae usus in universam theologiae influat disciplinam ejusque prope sit anima.*" (Encycl.) But above all, the Bible should be read, and read constantly, even whilst it is being studied in parts. "*Erit igitur,*" says St. Augustine, "*divinarum scripturaram solertissimus indagator, qui primo totas legerit notasque habuerit,*

etsi nondum intellectu, tamen lectione . . . . Prima observatio est, nosse istos libros, et si nondum ad intellectum, legendo tamen vel mandare memoriae, vel omnino incognitos non habere." (Doctr. Christ. ii, 8.) Such reading should be done systematically and under the guidance of an experienced teacher who may explain, in passing, the ordinary obscurities of passages which otherwise leave no definite impression on the mind.

We have only touched upon the subject to call attention to the important Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" and to give notice that the theme will hereafter be taken up in the REVIEW with that attention which its great importance for our times calls for.

THE EDITOR.

---

#### THE WEAK POINTS OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

WHAT are the salient weak points of the Catholic press in the United States to-day?

1. *Lack of standing.* Our religious papers are not official publications. They do not belong to the organism of the Church. They are not under ecclesiastical direction. They occasionally utter sentiments repugnant to the Bishops and detrimental to the *cause* which they ostensibly exist to promote. They are, in truth, business enterprises of laymen, and, on the whole, conducted more to make money than to further the chief interests of religion.

Three deplorable consequences flow from this lack of authority:

*a.* The clergy do nothing for the Catholic papers. That is the rule. There are exceptions to it, but they are comparatively few. The majority regard the religious press as the private property of its lay owners, which they have no duty to foster; consequently they do not write for it, they do not pay their subscription any more promptly than the average layman, and they do not urge their people to subscribe. They feel no interest in it; no obligation towards it. It does not belong to them as a body, nor to the diocese, nor to the

Church - why should they work in the pulpit, or, as spiritual advisers, in the confessional, to promote the support of journals primarily conducted for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of their lay proprietors?

Take notice, if you please, that I am not criticising these clerics, nor finding fault with them. I am simply stating their reason, as I understand it, for their attitude of indifference to the Catholic press.

This deficiency of standing has lately been more or less remedied in Chicago, Providence and San Francisco, where the Bishops and some of the priests have purchased the existing Catholic papers and put them under new management. In Baltimore, too, the Cardinal Archbishop, a few other clergymen and a dozen prominent laymen purchased, about two years ago, *The Catholic Mirror*, from the Methodist banker into whose possession it had fallen, and have leased it for a term of years to its present director. In New Orleans I believe that a similar arrangement exists.

The Fathers of our national Councils long ago noticed the damage done by irresponsible and unwisely-edited journals, and, as a partial remedy, they proposed that the Bishops support one Catholic paper in every province. (Cf. Conc. Pl. Balt. III Tit. vii, 227.) But this suggestion has not been carried out. Even in some dioceses there are two or three papers struggling for existence and contending with one another disedifyingly for patronage. Lately, in a city where there was one eminently satisfactory journal, an undesired opposition paper was started, practically in defiance of ecclesiastical authority. If ecclesiastical superiors actually controlled the Catholic press, the intrusive publication would not have been founded.

b. The laity do not feel bound to sustain papers which can not be identified with the interests of the Church, and which are understood to be undertakings of private individuals. They have heard that the Holy Father desires them to support the Catholic press, but they are sure that His Holiness does not mean that they must buy every publication that puts a cross and the name "Catholic" at the head of its

editorial column. Besides they have so long associated the journal they take with the man that owns it, that they consider as odd the proposition that it lies on their conscience to give him a living or add to his wealth. And if the transaction is to rest on a purely business basis, they want the worth of their money, and not a thin sheet of stale news, old scraps, selections from foreign periodicals and bickering paragraphs offered them for the price of a first-class publication.

c. The fifty millions of our non-Catholic neighbors have less respect now for the Catholic press, the private property of unauthorized laymen than they would have if it were the recognized organ of the Church. What do they care for the statements or the arguments of Mr. John Smith? He is not the Catholic Church, nor one of its appointed spokesmen. They are not certain that he voices the sentiments of the Church, or that he correctly states its doctrine. They will not listen to him as they would to an authoritative utterance made by an official print. The result? The Catholic press to-day has less influence than it could have with the immense multitude that surrounds us, makes a lighter impression on public opinion, leads to fewer conversions. If America is ever to be made Catholic, our press will have to be vitalized with fresh power and a higher life.

2. *Poverty.* The next most fruitful weakness is lack of capital. There is not one of our papers that has sufficient money for its proper management—not one. There is not one of them that could afford the weekly expenses of—let us say—the New York *Independent* or the Chicago *N. W. Christian Advocate*. There is not one of them able to fill its pages with original matter, even at third-rate prices; they are all made up mostly of clippings—selections from the daily papers, from the magazines, from books, from English and Irish journals and—from one another.

An attempt was lately made to form a Catholic Press Syndicate. Well-known writers were offered the sum of ten dollars for feature articles, provided that ten or more papers should take them at a cost of one dollar each. But the project speedily collapsed, because enough publications could

not, or would not, give one dollar a week for about two columns of first-class new matter to pay the cost of the writing. One contributor to the enterprise got five dollars for an essay that took him three days to write. Only five journals bought it out of the seventy-five to which it was sent by the originator of the syndicate. But after it appeared, it was copied, gratis, by several of those who would not pay a dollar for its use.

There are none of our papers that pay their editors the wages of a master mechanic, to say nothing of the average salary of other professional men—possibly all but two or three of them cannot afford to. Only half a dozen of them have a satisfactory equipment of type and machinery. Not more than five of them have a fairly well-paid corps of canvassers. In all their departments—editorial, special articles, news and business—they are crippled for want of means. They have not the funds to produce a better article or to push its sale. There is not one first-class Catholic paper in the United States; not one, for instance, as good as the London *Tablet* or the New York *Christian Union*. There is not one that the twelve millions of Catholics in this country can point to as representative of the highest scholarship, the finest literary taste, and the ideal family life amongst them.

There is little profit in the Catholic newspaper business, for the field is relatively sterile, and therefore men with money, seeking remunerative investments, go elsewhere with their capital, leaving the work, as the representatives of the Church leave it, to printers with more enterprise than erudition, and less resources than either, and to other persons of limited means. Thus the Catholic press drags its slow length along, anaemic, stunted, half-starved, without force or ambition or expectation, lacking the strength to cultivate properly the immense territory that belongs to it.

3. *Want of competent editors.* To natural ability for literary work and a thorough college course—including two years of philosophy—the ideal director of a Catholic journal should have added a special course of study in theology, church history, social economy, physical science, education, American



history, etc., in order to equip him suitably for his great life-work. He should have done service on the daily press, so as to have gotten the benefit of its experience and training and have been made to live in the present age. He should have cultivated style and be able to produce solid articles acceptable to the metropolitan journals and the secular magazines. Latin he should know almost as well as English, and a smattering at least of Italian, French and German would not come amiss. At the same time his sympathies should be sufficiently broad and his editorial sense practical enough to enable him to cater to low as well as to high, to the children as well as to grown folk, to the laity as well as to the clergy, to the women as well as to the men of his motley clientele.

The late P. V. Hickey had nearly all of these qualifications. But who else has? Excluding the half dozen priest-editors, what layman now working on the Catholic press would be selected by the hierarchy as the champion of the Catholic cause in the forum of public opinion against such assailants as Huxley, Schaff and Ingersoll? If such a knight were needed to-morrow for an intellectual tourney, would one of our editors be selected? Would all of them do?

A stream will not rise higher than its source, nor, as a rule will employés be worth in the long run more than their pay. The Catholic papers are poor pay and they get poor writers. If a man engaged by any of them develops uncommon ability as a journalist, he can always make more than the salary the best of them offer by giving his services to secular literary enterprises. He might choose to practise poverty himself, but if he be married the claims of his wife and children to a home and a competence will likely call him away from the Catholic press to occupations wherein these goods are possible of attainment. They have called away some of the cleverest writers our papers have had.

Reverence is due to the gifted laymen who have sacrificed their temporal interests in pursuit of a Providential vocation on the Catholic press. But who respects a poor man? Who courts his friendship? Who invites him to table?

4. *Vagaries.* The fourth hindrance to the perfect success of the Catholic papers is their failure to respect the limits of the field of religious journalism. The press should be a help to the Church, the printed echo of the living voice of the Apostles, a coadjutor to the clergy, accepting its place and its task in the line of battle from the divinely commissioned leaders of the conflict, submissive to speak or to be silent, to adopt or reject a policy, as the hierarchy may direct. In no other way is its existence beneficial. Too often it is a detriment to Christ. It washes the family linen in public; it is prone to personal abuse; it lacks courtesy in controversy; it wrangles on matters that should not be discussed in public, and persists in carrying on disputations even after the Holy Father has commanded peace. The faithful are scandalized and non-Catholics are turned away. The place of the Catholic editor is subordinate. It is not his to initiate, nor to direct, nor to rule, nor to "force the hand" of his superiors. Some of our papers have endeavored to regulate the diocese in which they were published, and some of our writers seem determined to "boss" the Bishops and the Pope.

5. *Partisanship in politics.* A fifth source of weakness for the Catholic press as an organ of the Church, is that most of our papers have partisan political affiliations. This defect is intensified by the fact that these politico-religious journals are nearly all on one side. The Church is not Democratic with a big D, but a majority of the Catholic papers are. One result of this is that in the public mind it is taken for granted that every Catholic is a Democrat and that there is some connection between the Democratic party and the Catholic Church. This supposition does the Church injustice and puts it in a false public position. So prevalent is it even among our intelligent neighbors that the cantankerous Protestant Episcopal "Bishop of Western New York" could throw it up to the Most Rev. Delegate Apostolic. Nor is he alone in holding it as indisputable. Many Protestant preachers and all the secret *Know-Nothing* societies are re-iterating the same story. And they use every

new expression of interest in partisan Democratic affairs appearing in our publications, as fresh proof of it. Religious papers, as such, have no business to meddle with partisan politics. They should discuss opportunely fundamental politico-moral principles, and, if faith or morals or Catholic rights be in jeopardy, they should be bold for the right, regardless of parties or politicians who may be helped or hindered by their utterance. Otherwise they sacrifice the *Cause* that they exist to advocate, in order to advance, their temporal party affiliations. They have done this over and over again.

The few Republican Catholic papers are as offensive and as radical in the support of their party as are their Democratic contemporaries.

The only safe rule is not to identify the Catholic religion with any party—Democratic, Republican, Populist, Greenback, Prohibition, or Single Tax—but to tell the truth, when need is, of all and to all.

6. *Lack of solidarity* Another glaring failing of the Catholic papers is the absence of concord of opinion. It seems impossible for them all in any crisis to say the same thing. Their counsels are always divided. The critical spirit, the love of singularity, the desire to be conspicuous for independence, keep them at odds. On no question of the day do they present an unbroken front. Even in vital matters affecting the relations of Church and State or the dealings of the Catholic body with outsiders they differ, when prudence at least dictates that, if they be not all of one mind, the few should yield their peculiar views to the general welfare. For instance, even in the case of the warfare waged against the Catholic Indian Schools by Commissioner Morgan, some Catholic papers defended him while Bishop after Bishop testified that he was ruining their missions among the aborigines, and they clamorously advocated the re-election of the President who gave him his destructive authority and who, if retained in the White House himself, would have kept him in office.

Are the rulers of the Church somewhat responsible for

this lack of solidarity? If the hierarchy were to pass along to the Catholic papers a hint to take this or that attitude toward the public schools, for instance, would not their wish be taken as law? Could not a similar unanimity be had on all matters by a like means? Of course, the Bishops would have to be united themselves, to effect this alignment of our papers.

Unfortunately, as it seems to me, our prelates do not make use of the Catholic press, do not utilize the tremendous force that could be applied to public opinion by concerted action on the part of our four score journals. As an illustration of this neglect let me mention that when Mr. Morgan began his assault on the Catholic Indian Bureau a Catholic editor wrote to its reverend manager for information and guidance, so as to get ammunition and direction for the defense of that institution and to know what attitude to make his paper take towards the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and to the then administration. No answer was received. Obtaining no help from headquarters, he wrought in the dark as best he could. Throughout the whole trouble no use was made of the Catholic press by the Bureau. What the Catholic editors did for it they did of their own accord, without advice or aid from it.

7. *Improper advertisements.* The last noticeable shortcoming of the Catholic press is its willingness to accept undesirable advertisements. Too many of our papers help along the business of gin-shops, quack-medicine venders, snide jewelry dealers, real estate speculators, etc. These advertisements react injuriously on the press in divers ways—by depreciating them in the esteem of the general public, by shocking those of our non-Catholic neighbors who look upon rum as a product of the devil and who are amazed to see it have leave to be recommended by its makers through the medium of religious papers, and by discrediting them with their simple subscribers who, having been defrauded by some of their advertisers, blame them as well as the knaves directly responsible for the swindle.

Other weak points the Catholic press in the United States

has, but they are secondary, the product more or less direct of those above mentioned.

All the shortcomings of the Catholic press are traceable to lack of appreciation and want of support. If the rulers of the Church thought more of it and the people sustained it properly it would begin a new career.

L. W. REILLY.

---

### CLERICAL STUDIES.

#### NINETEENTH ARTICLE.

#### MORAL THEOLOGY.—(IV.)

#### ITS IMPERFECTIONS—HOW REMEDIED.

**H**ITHERTO we have spoken only in terms of admiration of the great system of moral doctrine which, gradually elaborated by the Catholic Church, moulded for ages the habits and life of individuals and societies, and still shows its indelible impress on those of the present day, even when they have drifted from the faith and disclaim all allegiance to Christianity. Yet we do not look upon our moral theology as perfect. No human science is perfect. In those which most satisfy and delight the mind there is always something incorrect or incomplete or needing a happier presentation. Moral theology is no exception to the general law, and we must not wonder if after the steady growth of so many centuries it still proves to some, in certain of its aspects, unsatisfactory and disappointing.

For instance, this feeling is not at all uncommon with thoughtful minds when introduced for the first time to the casuistry of the schools. Among other things they are struck painfully by the low moral level of the decisions given; sometimes, on the contrary, they are surprised at the strictness of theologians in dealing with seemingly venial delinquencies. To many the whole science, as it stands, seems to contain much that is arbitrary, or conventional, and to fit in with the facts and requirements of the moral life only in an imperfect and artificial way.

These and similar impressions deserve to be carefully considered, if only to remove what is mistaken in them, and to seek a remedy, as far as the nature of things will allow, to what proves to be founded.

To begin with the first mentioned, we may remark that the reproach of disingenuousness and laxity inflicted on the casuistry of the schools has nothing new in it. It was the great war-cry of the Jansenists two hundred years ago, nor have its echoes ceased to be heard ever since. Doctrines misstated, voluntarily or involuntarily, have often given and still give rise to such recriminations. But when all misapprehension has been removed there still remains enough to cause surprise to many; to the magistrate, for example, who cannot understand how theologians allow what he punishes; to the man of integrity, who finds practices tolerated by them which his nobler sense of things condemns; to the fervent Christian, who beholds the fundamental principles of the Gospel seemingly disregarded; occasionally to the general public, so much louder than our casuists in denunciation of certain modes of action especially unworthy.

Lack of space forbids us to adduce instances, but they will occur of themselves to most of our readers, and cannot fail to come before the uninitiated whenever they study consecutively our classical works, ancient and modern, on such subjects as: *De mendacio et aequivocatione; de promissione et juramento: de contractu ob causam turpem; de causis excusantibus a restitutione, etc., etc.*

In regard to the general question we are free to acknowledge that at certain periods, and in particular during the XVIIth century, strange doctrines were set afloat and widely propagated by a certain number of theologians, and that the scathing denunciations of Pascal, while occasionally extending too far, and unfairly concentrating all the odium on one class of theological writers, yet were, on the whole, far from undeserved. The Church herself virtually recognized it in the solemn condemnation of long lists of lax doctrines by Alexander VII and Innocent XI. "Sanctiss. D. N." is it

said in the first degree, (A. D. 1665) “*audivit non sine magno animi sui moerore, complures opiniones Christianaue disciplinae relaxativas, et animarum perniciem inferentes partim antiquas iterum suscitari, partim noviter prodire, et summam illam luxuriantium ingeniorum licentiam in dies magis excrescere, per quam in rebus ad conscientiam pertinentibus modus opinandi irrepsit alienus omnino ab evangelica simplicitate, sanctorumque Patrum doctrina, et quem, si pro recta regula fideles in praxi sequerentur, ingens eruptura esset Christianae vitae corruptela.*”

The forty-five theses which follow, the Pope declares to be “*ut minimum scandalosae,*” strictly forbidding them to be taught, held or carried into practice.

The depurating process, continued by Innocent XI, gives us, in the year 1679, a new list of sixty-five theses still more deserving, if possible, of pontifical censure. When we read them at the present day,<sup>1</sup> we stand amazed and abashed that such doctrines should have ever found their way into works written for the guidance of a Christian people, and that so many of them should have been originated by good and gifted men, or should even have won their assent. But a closer consideration of the circumstances accounts for it all; and at the same time conveys a lesson of abiding interest which it may not be amiss to gather in passing.

Two things principally seem to have given rise to and developed this laxity of moral doctrines among its supporters; on the one side a wish to make religion more acceptable to all; on the other, a habit of following out blindly logical deductions, regardless of what they led to. In connection with the first, we have to remember that the law of nature and of the Gospel finds men very unequally fitted to accomplish it. What one can do without effort another finds almost beyond his strength. Circumstances also make certain duties easy to some and seemingly impossible to others. And then, in the lives of peoples as of individuals, there are periods of

1 They may be found (besides the Bullarium) in *Viva: Theses damnatae*. Denziger, *Enchiridion*, and in various modern manuals of moral theology.

vigor and periods of weakness. Yet the law is meant equally for all times and for all men. The consequence is that, as an imperative rule, it has to be kept at a pretty low level. There are heroes among men, but the average man is not of heroic build, and so the law has to be adapted to his stature. In the early Church, when Christians were few and secluded in a great measure from the world, the standard of Christian life was high; but as their numbers increased, and chiefly when whole cities and nations offered to embrace the faith, they had to be admitted on easier terms. Still more lenient, in many respects, were the conditions made to the barbarians, the object of the Church being to accommodate herself, so far as was possible without any sacrifice of principle, to the requirements of her rude and uncultured children. Those of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries were highly refined on the contrary, strong in the faith, but with strong passions too, while their energies, weakened by the general softness of the age or by personal indulgence, were often barely equal to the lowest admissible standard of obligation. Hence the natural wish of casuists, daily appealed to by confessors in distress, to make duty as easy as possible, with the unavoidable consequence of sacrificing occasionally what should never have been given up.

The theological methods of the period lent themselves admirably to the process of self-deceit. Argument from analogy, for instance, constantly and rightly used in moral theology, led on by imperceptible degrees to the most objectionable conclusions. Thus, because it was held lawful to imperil or even to do away with the life of the unjust aggressor of one's own life or fortune, the same right was gradually extended in regard to the slanderer, on the plea that character was more precious than wealth;—to the unjust accuser, witness or judge, when there was no other means of escape;<sup>1</sup> to the thief who carried off a small sum of money<sup>2</sup>.

1 *Licet interficere falsum accusatorem, falsos testes, aut etiam judicem a quo iniqua certa imminet sententia, si alia via non potest innocens damnum evitare.* (Alex. VII, *damn. prop.* 18.)

2 *Regulariter possem occidere furem pro conservatione unius aurei.* (Innoc. XI, *damn. prop.* 31.)



In the same way, by following out logically certain general principles incautiously admitted without restriction, casuists were betrayed into consequences utterly repugnant to the moral sense. This happened especially in connection with the theories of probabilism widely diffused just at that time. To their injudicious use the historian of moral doctrines cannot fail to trace back most of the lax positions condemned by the Church. Like so many other theories which ultimately prevail, probabilism was very slow to assume its proper shape and settle down on its true foundations. It came forth, not as a discovery in morals, nor as a new conception of human duty, but rather as a way of accounting for what men had been conscientiously doing hitherto, and what it would be reasonable at all times to expect from them. This, at least, was the principle underlying the adhesion given to it by the bulk of its followers. Unfortunately the rules laid down and the reasons given in support of them led directly to the most objectionable consequences, of which many professional casuists were only too ready to avail themselves. But the great majority seem to have adopted them as a matter of logical consistency. Once the principle was laid down as belonging to the nature of things, that no doubt could give rise to a duty, or that no law the existence of which could reasonably be questioned, might not also be reasonably neglected, there could be no reason or room for exceptions. And so the rule was applied indiscriminately to all manner of duties—to truth, to justice, to the sacraments, as well as to human enactments, to the “*dubia facti*” as well as to the “*dubia juris.*” What else could be done? To stop short in the course of logical deduction would have led to questioning the principles; and if the “principles,” vigorously assailed already by the opposite school, had eventually to go, what was to become of probabilism itself and of the easing of consciences to which it had so admirably lent itself? And so they held on to their conclusions, expanding them more and more, until they were driven from them by the censures of the Church.

As a mental process there was nothing new in this. In

matters of knowledge as well as of conduct, principles are often admitted not on the strength of their wisdom, but as a plausible way of accounting for or justifying facts, and they hold their ground until the inadmissible consequences to which they lead reveal their unsoundness. All right conduct rests on principles, but the difficulty is to discern and formulate them with perfect accuracy. Almost all the errors of political, economic and social science are the logical consequence of principles extremely plausible, unquestionable, it may be, in themselves. Only common sense and experience show with what limitations they have to be accepted. Ethical principles have similar tests and counterpoises, as we shall see, and it is because our over-indulgent casuists failed to apply them that they were betrayed into propounding such regrettable rules of conduct.

The sequel of their history is known to all theological students. Compelled on the one side by the pontifical censure to retreat from their more advanced positions, they were hotly pursued on the other by the stricter theology which they had stirred up against them from the beginning, and the two schools, the rigid and the indulgent, continued to flourish side by side through the last and earlier part of the present century. In St. Liguori they met and blended in such happy proportions, that his decisions, commonly followed by subsequent writers, may be looked upon as the type and rule of modern casuistry.

But it is just against this very rule that objections are raised at the present day, on the plea of its being in many particulars beneath the requirements of Christian feeling, of public opinion, and even of the civil law.

Now the difficulty seems to us to originate in a total misapprehension of what casuistry aims at, and is really meant for. Its object is in no wise to establish an ideal, but simply to determine a minimum of duty. The moralist holds up ideals to which a man and a Christian may, and in some sense, should aspire: the casuist considers only to what he is strictly bound. His whole concern is to establish the "scientia liciti et illiciti." He is in morals what the writer

on criminal law is in jurisprudence. The latter may be the most noble-minded and best of men, but, as a criminalist, he has to deal, not with high aims and generous actions, but with crimes, trespasses and misdemeanors. Unscrupulous men, whose only care is to escape the grip of the law, may appeal to his knowledge or consult his books, but neither were ever meant to encourage or benefit such people. In the same way the casuist goes over the whole field of human duty, weighing and measuring each of its elements, and confining them within the narrowest limits. Low-minded, ungenerous souls, ever seeking to serve God on the easiest terms, may follow on his footsteps and avail themselves of his leniency to settle down on a low level of life. They may even learn from him the art of sailing as close as possible to the wind without floundering; in other words, of paring down duties to the barest margin and of raising doubts where conscience knows none, as a dishonest lawyer raises technical points to dispense a client from paying his debts. But the purpose of the casuist is foreign to such ends. He thinks of the number of struggling souls, willing in the spirit but weak in the flesh, encompassed with difficulties yet striving to keep the kingdom of God and His justice uppermost in their aims and in their lives. And if he be a confessor, every day he has to do with cases of personal difficulty of which the general public has not the slightest suspicion, and where nothing short of a heroic strain can secure faithfulness to what most people accomplish almost without an effort. Who in such circumstances would not aspire to bring the law within the reach of these struggling souls and make it possible for them to hang on to God at least by their essential obligations? True, such lives are far removed from the Christian ideal. But will greater strictness bring them nearer to it? The Jansenists tried it, with the general result of lifting up a few to a high degree of self-righteousness and allowing the vast majority of their followers to drift into a total neglect of the established means of grace, and finally to lose their hold on the faith.

Thus then casuistry, as limiting human obligations, is a

most useful function of moral science, but only one of its many functions. The confessor turns to it as a spiritual physician or as a judge, but not as a moral guide. In this last capacity his duty is ever to point to what is higher ; ever to encourage souls to what is purest and noblest. In the meantime he has to stand beside them, and when he fails to win them to what is best, he has still reason to rejoice if he keep them from the worst. The magistrate may sometimes find fault with his decisions, but it is only in his official capacity or from a forensic standpoint. Appealed to as an observer of human nature and as a man, he will ordinarily be in agreement with him, and be ready, even as a judge, to strain a point of law in order to show mercy to such as deserve it. The strain put on by casuists is occasionally great indeed, and seems at first sight to justify the definition of their practice as "the art of cheating consciences and quibbling with God;" but closer observation ordinarily corrects the impression. It is in fact a maxim of canon law that burdensome enactments have to be kept within the narrowest limits: *odiosa sunt restringenda* ; and this may occasionally require what will look like disingenuous fencing. Indeed, it is only by a process of interpretation which in other matters would be dishonest, that many laws of the Church, no longer suited to the times yet never abrogated, have been practically set aside. A similar process may be occasionally necessary to harmonize the imperfect formulas of the natural or divine law with the practical requirements of life. The old Roman Jurisprudence and the Common Law of England are full of such subtleties which shock only the uninitiated. The practice, we confess, is full of danger, and only those can escape it who are ever alive to the inner promptings of the moral faculty and whose whole souls are attuned to the ethical traditions of the Catholic Church.

Neither can the casuist afford to neglect the warnings of the public conscience. What it condemns he can scarce at any time safely allow ; Christian righteousness cannot sink beneath secular morality. This is a wide-reaching principle

not always sufficiently kept in view. Casuists who work out their problems on abstract principles are not unfrequently betrayed into concessions which the popular conscience condemns : yet the social verdict is a safer guide in all that concerns human interests, representing, as it does, a general estimate born of daily experience. But it must be the common judgment, not that of a few whose personal interests may lead them to exaggerate their rights, especially when sanctioned by law.

Still less should the casuist be bound, in laying down his lines, by the higher law of honor. For honor is one thing and conscience another. Honor varies considerably with times and places ; morality is invariable, as based on the nature of things. Honor has its special laws and exigencies for each class of society ; morality is the same for all. Honor adopts and adds great additional power to certain moral duties, but ignores many others. It extends on the other hand its sanctions to some of the higher elements of social life which the moral rule may commend, but by no means enjoins. Hence the casuist, as such, has no more to do with it than the judge on the bench. But as a pastor or guide of souls, it is part of his duty to raise them up to the highest attainable level of principle and conduct. In the life of a true Christian there should be no room for what is mean or unworthy, any more than for what is sinful. He should be as truthful, as reliable, as high-minded as the very best of those among whom he moves, and the religious training which does not lead him to that end or in that direction is essentially defective. In fact for such as have been habituated to dwell in that higher sphere and breathe its purer air, there is no more need for ordinary casuistry than there is for the distinctions of criminal law for the man of pure life and generous aspirations. A few fundamental, obvious principles suffice to guide the action of one and the other ; or if casuistry there be, it is the nobler casuistry of honor or of the Gospel.

Here is a new section which might be added with advantage to our manuals of Theology,—the casuistry of the higher Christian life. Its elements exist, but scattered

through the Bible, the Fathers and the spiritual writers. To bring them together and place them side by side with the extenuated forms of goodness, as presented by ordinary casuistry, would be equally beneficial to priests and people. It would offer in particular the advantage of making them as familiar with the forms and degrees of the Christian virtues as the other does with the varieties and depths of human wickedness. It would constantly bring back to their minds the important fact that the Gospel calls not merely for negative goodness but for active devotion to all that is best. Indeed a more general return to the great principles of natural morality and of the Christian life would both elevate and simplify considerably even our ordinary casuistry. Its complex rules and endless applications have put them more or less out of sight, and to get back to them is often like emerging from darkness into daylight.

The same result would often be attained by a simple appeal to the unsophisticated conscience. Casuistry, after all, is much more an intuition of the cultured mind than a matter of applying rules or deducting from principles. The true casuist instinctively discerns what is right and what is wrong, and when he appeals to argument it is not so much to satisfy himself as to prove to others the correctness of his decisions. In this, as in similar matters of practical judgment, the conclusion will often be more true than the ostensible premises, the latter being of so complex a kind in the casuist's mind that it is extremely difficult for him to realize them all and still more so to give them adequate expression.<sup>1</sup>

Conscience, then, authority, rules, principles, experience, individual and collective, all should help to determine the moral value of actions and trace the line of imperative duty. Each may occasionally prove sufficient to decide single cases; none of them can be trusted alone to deal with conduct as a whole. Principles, as we have seen, run into extremes, and have constantly to be toned down by the practical knowledge

<sup>1</sup> On the Origin of Moral Convictions, see Card. Newman: *University Sermons: Faith and Reason, Grammar of Assent: Informal Inference.*

of life and its possibilities. When the old schools of Louvain contended that if love is the supreme, universal law of the Christian life, it has to be found in every individual action ; or again, that a Christian is bound, as such, to infuse the divine element of Christian motive into every free movement of his will, it was hard to disprove their position on *a priori* grounds. Or again, if we start from the divine precept of loving our neighbor as we love ourselves, to what will it not lead by pure logical deduction ? But authority and conscience decline to impose the extreme consequences ; experience declares them impracticable, and so they are dropped. The well-trained moral faculty is doubtless the surest of guides in most cases ; but a knowledge of principles is an essential part of the training. Deprived of their guidance, the most delicate sense of right and wrong is easily led astray by sympathies or antipathies, by exaggerated impressions or by morbid feelings.

In the same way common sense, strengthened by the experience of life, has a considerable part to play in the determination of duty ; but they who rely exclusively upon it for their decisions invariably lose sight of important positive prescriptions, miss essential differences, and are unconsciously led to make their personal knowledge of things, though necessarily limited, into universal principles, and thus find themselves in opposition with what the wisest and best are agreed upon.

As to the practice of deciding exclusively by standard rules or authorities, without leaving any play for one's own personal impressions or experience, it may be safe enough in a general way, and perhaps the best possible for those who have reason to distrust their own judgment. But it is, after all, only a mechanical method of treatment, like that of a half-trained physician who, conscious of his inexperience and lack of medical tact, deems it safer to keep to the established practice, and conform his prescriptions to the ordinary pharmacopæic directions, or simply prescribe patent medicines. There is, in particular, in all individual authorities, even the greatest, a local, or transient, or personal element

which detracts from the universal, permanent value of their decisions, so that a man of ordinary intelligence may often form by himself a more correct estimate of individual cases than he could ever gather from their writings. As a fact the ablest leaders are occasionally forsaken by their most faithful adherents. Who, for example, among the greatest admirers of Lugo would care to follow him to-day in all he permits for the defence of one's life or honor? Who of those who follow almost blindly the authority of St. Liguori feels entirely at liberty to apply his teaching in such matters as oaths or equivocations?

Thus tempered and balanced, ever approaching nearer to the golden mean, full of compassion for human frailty, but without favor for human meanness and selfishness, casuistry will prove helpful to many and debasing to none. True to the spirit of Him of Whom it was written: *the bruised reed he shall not break and the smoking flax he shall not extinguish*, it will go forth and go far to meet those who are honestly striving to be faithful; but it will be little concerned to accommodate those cold and mercenary souls whose only wish is to be saved without an effort; and, while ever ready to lessen, if not to remove, what is only a burden, it will maintain in their integrity and vigor those fundamental duties which are the very essence of the moral life, and a help, not a hindrance, to the weakest.

J. HOGAN.

---

#### A TRAINING SCHOOL FOR PAROCHIAL HOUSEKEEPERS.

THE project of devising means for the establishment of an institute destined to equip and supply priests' housekeepers cannot be without interest to many minds, both cleric and laic.

*Primum est vivere dein philosophari*, is the apt answer a Western bishop, whose means were small and diocese large, gave a solicitor and book-hawker. The "vivere" of a parish priest comes from his people, but income and expenditures



are, as a rule, in the hands of the housekeeper, upon whom depend in general the order, cleanliness and that air of domestic comfort which belong properly to the presbytery. Perhaps even the remark may be indorsed "that a pastor's own spiritual advancement hinges not inconsiderably on a good, a poor, or an indifferent service in domestic affairs." Indeed, the matter of housekeeping is for us of the clergy a cardinal point; and if there were some method by which we could assure ourselves that it is possible to obtain well-trained housekeepers who would manage the affairs of the pastoral residence in an economical and thoroughly satisfactory manner, it would be a decided advantage.

Some—let us for the sake of argument say many—are likely to object right here and say: "No organization of an institute to train and supply competent housekeepers is needed; the priests would never take such housekeepers; women so moulded would be likely to prove meddlesome, etc. Moreover, a priest taking a housekeeper, as a rule, wishes to train her himself; and our clergy would not like ready-made housekeepers. An institute for such would only become the headquarters for gossiping old maids, and a bureau of information as to what goes on in the different presbyteries of the land," etc., etc.

As a general answer it might be replied: Given no vocation to be a help-mate to the clergy; and given no disposition to do their duty, and remaining with all the faults of their sex at their age, and in their honored position, of course housekeepers would not generally fail to be notorious for headstrongness, a spirit of prying and the gift of gabbling. Do not untrained domestics now and here possess these undesirable characteristics so often that many a one has to change them every year or two?

Those servants who are fit and who fit themselves for such important posts do keep their hold on employer's esteem, and that precisely because they are blessed with virtues acceptable and appreciable.

But are not these exceptions? Therefore, women of sterling character, of mature age, and of studied capability, can,

by being taken in charge by prudent guides and instructresses experienced, be formed into the rule instead of being classed as the exception. A candidate who is found, after a proper novitiate, to be unfitted for her future work on account of marked proclivities towards the faults mentioned above, shall never go out certificated from the kind of "Martha Institute" which we have in mind and propose to the clerical readers of the REVIEW.

As to the statement that priests want, as a rule, to train their own housekeepers, we doubt very much whether that is the fact. Understood in one sense, viz., that they inform their servants how they want their marketing done, how they like their steak cooked or their bread baked, it may be true. But for the rest, who, of all our good Catholic pastors and assistants in these United States, wants to be pestered with the details of housekeeping? To scold about things not being kept in order; to give sharp directions about frying and boiling and broiling, and ironing and packing away the clothes, and keeping moths out of overcoats, and about dinners, and fuel, and haggling with butchers and green-grocers, is surely not what we greatly covet.

#### THE NOVELTY OF THE PROJECT

may startle some of my clerical brethren, and in reality close inquiry throughout the states, in Canada and France, has assured me that there exists no such institution as is here proposed, unless the *Soeurs de Ste. Marthe* who take charge of the women's work in some seminaries of Canada, may be classed in the category of clerical housekeepers.

Despite the absence of such a training-school, it must be admitted that a large number of priests have, in these States, satisfactory service, either by or under the supervision of their own sisters or near relatives, or again by hired help of tried fidelity, proved skill and unimpeachable conduct. But the trouble of procuring, and keeping until they are trained to suit the needs and understand the humors of their reverend patrons, persons of settled habits and made-up minds, is still a standing difficulty with probably the large majority of the

clergy. It is seldom that servants of the canonical age, required where such canons are of rigor and enforced, can, under our missionary status, be secured. Neither is it proposed, in the scheme under consideration, to demand of candidates, for the present, any more than that they be fully capable for the situation of helps, and of matronly age to fit them for the position of single housekeepers in the parochial home.

These remarks may be allowed to introduce some details in reference to a Constitution and Rules of a projected "Martha Institute." No vow is required on entering, or afterwards; a solemn promise, such as is ordinarily made to a Spiritual Director, renewed yearly, would constitute the sole pledge of fidelity exacted for the observance of the rules which govern the associates.

We pass over those points of the contemplated constitution which deal with the requisites of age, probation, distinctive dress, and special training in parochial housekeeping, essentials which could easily be regulated after the general norm of pious unions cultivating a field which lies midway between the religious and secular community life. An essential element would be the guarantee that the candidates undergo regular training at the hands of perfectly competent teachers of practical house-caring, and be imbued with an ever more and more thorough instruction as to their course of conduct in the household, under all ordinary and extraordinary circumstances, so as to fit them for their momentous vocation. It is needless to dwell in detail upon the plans conceived for the support of the Institution. The members are required to send quarterly a certain proportion of their cash salary to the officers at the Mother-house; and those at home, in training, or disabled and supported out of the common fund, should be expected to make their living by such combined exertions as shall be appointed and found suitable for each beneficiary at the proposed Martha House.

A necessary distinction for the right government of the Institute would be that of Matrons and Marthas.

The question of proper compensation might be regulated by some such statute as the following :

Marthas and Matrons shall be put out at service for a stipulated price, varying for country and city, single or combined service. They shall be allowed to retain for their own use all money received, except 15 or 25 per cent, respectively devoted to a Sinking Fund, or what shall have been legally donated to the Society.

Cases in which housekeepers have to provide for "help to dependent parents," etc., might be regulated by a similar clause :

If members have parents, or possibly children, whom they find themselves bound to support or assist, they may devote part of their per cent. dues and own money for this purpose, with the permission of the Superiors.

The question of *a distinctive dress* may prove somewhat difficult. We would suggest that the only distinction in dress be a cape such as Sisters generally wear, and an ordinary hood, scoop or plain straw hat for summer. It is only at Retreats and Elections that members shall be required to wear the bonnet and cape blessed for them and put upon them at their reception. Wearers may choose their own material for dress, as they are always required, when not superannuated or unable, to furnish and buy their own clothing.

#### WHAT PRIESTS AND PRELATES SAY ABOUT THE PROPOSED INSTITUTE.

In connection with the suggestions thus far given of the proposed "Martha Institute," we may be allowed to give specimens of the opinions of some pastors and prelates whom we consulted as to the practicability of the idea, and to whom we gave only ground-lines of the project. For obvious reasons we publish only the opinions, not the names of the ecclesiastics who kindly undertook to pass on the merits *pro* and *con* of the project.

"As to the desirability of some such institution as you propose," writes one venerable dignitary of the Church. "I should say it would tend to relieve pastors of a great deal of trouble in procuring

suitable housekeepers—both as regards their own good, and the spiritual good of the housekeepers. The general idea of the Institute, its rules, etc., is well conceived.”

Another, a writer of international reputation, and a thoroughly spiritual as well as practical man, entered so completely and heartily into the scheme that he debated its salient points for an hour with the writer, procuring also the advice of the Superioress of a large community of Religious.

A prelate in one of the Eastern Dioceses writes :

“MY DEAR FATHER : I admire the motive that has prompted your undertaking, and I have no doubt that it is planned on lines of prudence and wisdom ; but really it is a matter entirely outside of my line, and on which I would not dare to pass any judgment whatsoever.<sup>1</sup> Of course the housekeeping problem is a matter of some importance and some difficulty to us, as it is to every one who has to keep house ; and it may be that in the future we shall have to look to some organization like the one proposed to undertake our housekeeping. When that time comes, I trust that your Martha Institute will be fully at work, and I hope it may prove itself the best for our purpose.”

Needless to add, the allusion above is to an extensive educational establishment of clerics.

A Right Reverend friend from the North Atlantic States says pointedly :

“REVEREND AND DEAR FATHER : I have examined the form which you sent me, and I cannot improve on it. I took the liberty of sending it to Bishop ——. Such an institution as you describe would be an excellent one ; I hope you may succeed.”

Monsignor X. ——, from the Ohio Valley, with his Vicar General, at first asked time for consideration, and after some sharp pointed advice, was pleased to say :

<sup>1</sup> In a second letter he gave the assurance that he had not been misrepresented in being put down as an approver of the general scheme.

“The constitution and rules of your proposed society are all O. K. . . . If you go on with it, be sure (1) to select a good ‘common-sense’ matron of experience and mature years ; (2) do not allow every dissatisfied domestic to swoop down on the house as to a haven of rest, where they will have their own way ; (3) protect yourself and institution from financial litigation.”

All which has been duly considered and guarded against, as far as may be. But, the financial running of the scheme does not interest the body of the clergy. They will naturally let that take care of itself, provided the right kind of caretakers of parsonages and their reverend inmates are turned out.

“DEAR FRIEND : The idea of a ‘Martha’s Society’ is an excellent one. I have no experience in the matter of such a society, which exists already in France, but it seems to me the rules are prudent, simple and good. Perhaps it might be well to recite, morning and night, a special prayer conformable to their state and vocation—grace, reserve, industry and patience.”

In conclusion we may say that all the suggestions received have been carefully weighed and we are prepared to submit a complete system of Constitutions and Rules likely to cover the entire ground in the event of the realization of such an institution as is here proposed.

Confratres, quid vobis videtur?

If discussions of these particulars be desired, the undersigned will be pleased to hear from his confrères either in public print or by private letter.

To make the important matter personal, the writer would beg to submit the following circular, respectfully addressed to our 5,100 resident priests, thirty-four seminaries and ninety colleges, conducted by secular or by regular clergy who have not affiliated sisterhoods.

REVEREND DEAR SIR : You cannot help being interested in what touches the daily life of every rector who has a home and

needs not only a cook but a care-taker, and above all, a house-keeper.

Your experience will bear me out in asserting that pastors and presidents of male institutions feel the need of a regular system in the matter of the demand and supply of specially trained servants. We demand, and must be supplied with, not mere girls, but women, instructed in their duties, discreet and correct in their deportment, skilled to the best attainable degree in their daily and hourly work. The *Martha Institute*, which is awaiting the expressed consent of a sufficient number of Ordinaries, Superiors and resident permanent and missionary Rectors, to guarantee its maintenance, has for its original and sole purpose the selection of vigorous women, mature and capable of training, whose firm consent is secured to devote themselves to serving priests and institutions as a life vocation. Those so called out are then taught for months or years, as the case demands and permits, by experts in domestic affairs, who shall give them technical instruction, followed up on the spot by practice and exercise of the art indispensably necessary to make them fully conversant with the duties and responsibilities of their station.

It is in purpose to establish a *bona fide*, conscientious agency, run under Catholic and approved auspices, to train and supply housekeepers to priests and male institutions having no other or better resource. The indenture of these servants, who shall know they are such, shall be provided in proper business form of contract, at stipulated prices, graded according to circumstances and number employed under the same contract.

As it is ardently desired to bring this scheme into active operation in this present eventful year for Church and country, we would very respectfully and in good faith beg your opinion about the project. The suggestion of such features as your wisdom and experience shall dictate to help us in perfecting the Constitution and Rules of The Martha Institute, will not be regarded as an intrusion, but will be received as a favor to be grateful for, by

*St. Lawrence, Ky.*

THOMAS J. JENKINS.

## CONFERENCES.

## REQUIEM MASS ON SUNDAYS.

*Qu.* Some of the readers of your esteemed Review would be pleased to have your opinion in the following cases :—

1. The relatives of a deceased person, who died on Friday afternoon, desire that the funeral take place on the following Sunday morning, with Requiem high Mass. The Sunday designated is of the rite of the second class. In the congregation referred to, there are two Masses on Sunday and but one priest, who has the privilege of duplicating, to meet the necessities of his people. The pastor after reading the Ordo juxta rubricas emendatas Breviarii Missalisque Romani, monitum 8, (F), decides to sing a Mass de Requiem at the usual hour for the second Mass (corpore praesente).

It might be added that there is no diocesan law regulating this matter, and the case occurs in a diocese where there are no parishes, sensu canonico. Did the pastor act in accordance with the rubrics?

2. Where only one Mass is said, but under otherwise similar circumstances, could a missa cantata de Requiem be offered for the deceased?

SACERDOS.

*Resp.* The rubrics forbid a Requiem Mass *praesente corpore* on feasts *Dupl. I. cl. et de praecepto*.

With regard to Sundays and feasts *de praecepto* which are not *Dupl. I. cl.* a distinction is made. In parish churches where there is but one Mass on these days, that Mass must be said in conformity with the rite of the Sunday or feast, as is evident from the following decree :

“ An in iis locis ubi una tantum celebratur missa diebus Dominicis et festivis per annum (non tamen solemnioribus) dum aliquis mane sepelitur, et missa dicitur ante sepulturam, corpore praesente,



debeat haec missa dici de *Requiem* ut in die obitus, vel potius tamquam missa conventualis cui populus assistit, debeat cantari de die, et missa de *Requiem* transferri ad primam diem non impeditam?

*Resp.* Negative ad primam partem; affirmative ad secundam.”  
(S. R. C., 26 Jan., 1793.)

Where there are two or more Masses, the principal or parochial Mass is of the Sunday or festal rite; the second and other Masses may be *de Requiem*. As the so-called *late* mass which is usually celebrated with chant and sermon is considered the parochial Mass, it follows that funeral Masses, whether they are chanted or not should be celebrated at a different hour. Where there is but one priest who is obliged to duplicate, the rule holds equally, since the law makes no distinction. The first Mass should be selected for the Requiem.

But what if the first Mass is too early for the funeral to be present; or if the priest cannot sing two Masses, whilst at the same time it would be very inconvenient to transfer the Requiem to the next vacant day? In that case there is no doubt that the order might be reversed without infringing upon the spirit of the liturgical law. The distinction between the conventual and other Masses is, in the first place, not as marked with us, as in Catholic countries where the solemn offices are regularly celebrated at a stated hour and with distinct ceremonial. Moreover it is often difficult to say whether one or other of the early Masses may not be considered as the principal, though less solemn, service, because the larger number of the congregation are present and a short practical instruction given at the time makes it a parochial Mass in the true sense of the word.

---

#### CONFIRMATION IN “ARTICULO MORTIS.”

*Qu.* Recently, whilst our Bishop stopped with me after having administered the Sacrament of Confirmation in the parish church, I was called to a dying Protestant who had expressed a desire to embrace the Catholic faith. He was very weak and hardly able to speak. However, the wish of dying in the true fold of Christ being

plainly expressed on his part, I made a profession of faith and an act of sorrow for sin which he repeated as best he could, and then I baptized him *sub conditione*. The thought immediately occurred to me to bring the Bishop to the house and have the sick man receive the Sacrament of Confirmation. Accidentally this was prevented. Could I have done so under the supposition that though the dying convert was not instructed as to the character and efficacy of the Sacrament of Confirmation, he no doubt wished to receive the benefit of every grace within his reach at the time?

*Resp.* In the given case the Sacrament of Confirmation should not be administered unless the dying person have at least a general knowledge of its virtue and the wish to receive the specific graces which it imparts. The S. Congregation S. Officii gave some years ago, a decision upon a similar case referring to the condition of the Eastern missions. The question asked was: *Utrum danda sit Confirmatio illis neophytis, qui in articulo mortis baptizati omnino rudes sunt, et vi morbi defatigati, instrui nequeunt?* The answer was: *Non conferendum Sacramentum Confirmationis illis neophytis moribundis, quos missionarius capaces Baptismi credit, nisi saltem habeant aliquam intentionem percipiendi Confirmationem ad robur animae suae adjiciendum.*" (S. C. S. Officii, 10 Apr. 1861.)

#### REQUIEM MASS ON THE EPIPHANY.

*Qu.* Is there any sanction for the practice of celebrating a Requiem Mass *praesente cadavere* on the feast of the Epiphany? The author of Pustet's Ordo seems to think so.

*Resp.* We doubt it. The Indult abrogating the feast distinctly states "non tamen quoad solemnitatem externam." (Cf. Conc. Pl. Balt. III, n. 111.) This makes the Decree of 23 Mai. 1835, given to France, which forbids Requiem Masses on the Epiphany, though no longer a holy day of obligation, applicable to us. Want of space prevents our giving the Decree here in full. (Cf. De Herdt. Vol. I, n. 56, 3.)

## ANALECTA.

## ELENCHUS FESTORUM PRIMARIORUM ET SECUNDARIORUM.

## DECRETUM GENERALE S. R. C.

Iuxta decretum diei 2 Iulii nuper elapsi (1)<sup>1</sup> quum a me infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Praefecto, et Relatore in Ordinariis Comitibus, subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunatis, proposita fuerit approbanda Catalogus Festorum, quæ uti *primaria* vel *secundaria* retinenda sunt; Emi et Rmi Patres Sacris tuendis Ritibus praepositi, audito voce et scripto R. P. D. Augustino Caprara S. Fidei Promotore, ita rescribere rati sunt: AFFIRMATIVE; *erecto ad ritum Duplicis Maioris, in Calendario universali, festo Dedicationis Basilicae SSmi Salvatoris, si Sanctissimo placuerit. Catalogus vero ita se habeat:*

## FESTA PRIMARIA IN CALENDARIO UNIVERSALI.

§ I. *Duplicia Primae Classis.*

Nativitas Domini.

Epiphania Domini.

Pascha Resurrectionis.

Ascensio Domini.

Pentecostes.

Festum Corporis Christi.

Assumptio, et Immaculata Conceptio B. M. V.

Nativitas S. Ioannis Baptistae.

Festum S. Ioseph Sponsi B. M. V.

Festum Ss. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli.

Festum Omnium Sanctorum.

Dedicatio propriae Ecclesiae.

Patronus, vel Titulus Ecclesiae.

Patronus Principalis Regionis, vel Dioecesis, aut loci.

1 Ad *Dub.* An Festa Secundaria Domini, B. M. V., Angelorum, SS. Apostolorum aliorumque Sanctorum praeferenda sint Festis Primariis ejusd. rit. et classis, sed minoris personalis dignitatis, tam in occurso quam in concursu et in eorundem repositione?

*Resp.* Festa Primaria praedicta, utpote solemniora, aliis secundariis in casu praeferenda esse tam in occurso quam in concursu, ad formam Rubr. X de Translatione Fest. n. 6. Quod si eadem Festa transferri contingat, in illorum repositione servetur Ordo praescriptus in memorata Rubrica n. 7.

§ II. *Duplicia Secundae Classis.*

Circumcisio Domini.  
 Festum SSmae Trinitatis.  
 Purificatio B. Mariae V.  
 Annuntiatio B. Mariae V.  
 Visitatio B. Mariae V.  
 Nativitatis B. Mariae V.  
 Dedicatio S. Michaelis Archangeli.  
 Natalitia Undecim Apostolorum.  
 Festa Evangelistarum.  
 Festum St. Stephani Protomartyris.  
 Festum Ss. Innocentium Martyrum.  
 Festum S. Laurentii Martyris.  
 Festum S. Annae, Matris B. M. V.  
 Festum S. Ioachim, patris B. M. V.

§ III. *Duplicia Maiora per Annum.*

Transfiguratio Domini.  
 Dedicatio Basilicae Ssmi Salvatoris.  
 Dedicatio S. Mariae ad Nives.  
 Festum Ss. Angelorum Custodum.  
 Dedicatio Basilicorum Ss. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum.  
 Festum S. Barnabae.  
 Festum S. Benedicti Abb.  
 Festum S. Dominici C.  
 Festum S. Francisci C.  
 Festum Patronorum minus Principalium.

§ IV. *Alia Duplicia per Annum.*

Dies Natalitia, vel quasi Natalitia uniuscuiusque Sancti.

## FRO ALIQUIBUS LOCIS.

S. Gabrielis Archangeli.  
 S. Raphaelis Archangeli.  
 Dies Natalitia, vel quasi Natalitia uniuscuiusque Sancti.  
 Commemoratio Sanctorum, quorum Corpora, vel Reliquiae  
 in Ecclesiis Dioeceseos asservantur.

## FESTA SECUNDARIA IN CALENDARIO UNIVERSALI.

§ I. *Duplicia Primae Classis.*

Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu.

§ II. *Duplicia Secundae Classis.*

Festum Ssmi Nominis Iesu.  
 Festum Inventionis S. Crucis.  
 Festum Pretiosissimi Sanguinis D. N. I. C.  
 Solemnitas Ssmi Rosarii B. M. V.  
 Festum Patrocinii S. Ioseph.

§ III. *Duplicia Maiora.*

Exaltatio S. Crucis.  
 Duo Festa Septem Dolorum B. M. V.  
 Commemoratio B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo.  
 Festum Ssmi Nominis B. M. V.  
 Festum de Mercede B. M. V.  
 Praesentatio B. M. V.  
 Apparitio S. Michaelis Archangeli.  
 Decollatio S. Ioannis Baptistae.  
 Cathedra S. Petri Ap., utraque.  
 Festum eiusdem ad Vincula.  
 Conversio, et Commemoratio S. Pauli Ap.  
 Festum S. Ioannis ante portam Latinam.

## PRO ALIQUIBUS LOCIS.

Officia Mysteriorum et Instrumentorum Passionis D. N. I. C.  
 Ssmi Redemptoris.  
 Sanctae Familiae Iesu, Mariae, Iosephi.  
 Ssmi Cordis Mariae.  
 Desponsationis, Maternitatis, Puritatis, Patrocinii B. M. V.  
 Translationis Almae Domus B. M. V.  
 Expectationis Partus B. V. M.  
 B. M. V. Auxilium Christianorum.  
 Prodigiolorum B. M. V.  
 Apparitionis B. M. V. Immaculatae.  
 Commemoratio Omnium Ss. Summorum Pontificum.  
 Item alia quaecumque festa sive Domini, sive B. M. V. sub aliquo peculiari titulo, sive Sanctorum, praeter eorundem natalem diem, uti Inventionis Corporum, Translationis, Receptionis, Patrocinii, et hisce similia.

Die 22 Augusti 1893.

Facta postmodum Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII, de his omnibus relatione per me ipsum infra-scriptum Cardinalem Praefectum, Sanctitas Sua duplicem Catalogum, prouti superius exstat, approbavit ac vulgari praecepit; elevato ad ritum duplicem maiorem, una cum

festo Dedicationis Basilicae Sami Salvatoris, festo etiam Dedicationis Basilicarum Ss. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum. Die 27, iisdem mense et anno.

CAIETANUS *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA

*S. R. C. Praefectus.*

Loco ✠ Sigilli

VINCENTIUS NUSSI

*S. R. C. Secretarius.*

---

**CONCESSIO OFFICII B. LANUINI PRO CARTHUSIANIS.**

*Ex S. R. C. 27 Jun. 1893.*

Quum per Decretum diei 4 Februarii vertentis anni Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII ecclesiasticum cultum ab immemorabili tempore Beato Lanuino Sancti Bruonis Socio praestitum confirmare dignatus fuerit ; Rmus Procurator Generalis Ordinis Carthusianorum, cunctorum ipsius Ordinis Alumnorum vota depromens, eundem Sanctissimum Dominum Nostrum humillime exoravit, ut facultatem impertiri dignaretur Festum ejusdem Beati Lanuini cum Officio et Missa juxta ipsius Ordinis rubricas peragendi. Sacra Rituum Congregatio, subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunata, dum Officium, Missam et Elogium pro Martyrologio in usum Dioecesis Suillacen. approbavit, indulisit, ut idem Festum in universo Carthusianorum Ordine die undecima Aprilis recoli valeat iuxta peculiare ipsius Ordinis Rubricas. Die 27 Junii 1893.

L. ✠ S.

✠ *Caj. Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *S. R. C. Praef.*

PRO. R. P. D. VINC. NUSSI. *Secret.*

JOANNES PONZI, *Substitutus.*

---

**CIRCA ANTIPHONAM AD "MAGNIFICAT," QUUM TRANSFERENDUM EST FESTUM APPARITIONIS B. M. V. "DE LOURDES."**

De mandato Rmi Episcopi Lunionen. hodiernus Kalendarii dioecesanii redactor S. Rit. C. sequens Dubium pro opportuna solutione humillime subicit, nimirum :

Quando festum Apparitionis B. M. V. Immac. ultra diem undecimam Februarii transferri contingat, uti proximo anno

1894 evenit, propter occursum Dominicae primae Quadragesimae, in secundis vesperis Apparitionis ad *Magnificat*, usurpari debet Antiphona "*Hodie gloriosa*" quae propria videtur diei Apparitionis, 11 Februarii, an potius Antiphona "*Ista est columba*" ut in primis Vesperis?

Et S. eadem Congr. ad relationem infrascripti Substituti secretariae S. Rituum Congregationis, exquisito voto alterius ex Apost. Caeremoniarum Magistris, ita proposito dubio rescribere rata est, videlicet *affirmative* ad primam partem; *negative* ad secundam. Atque ita rescripsit die 11 Augusti 1893.

L. ✠ S.

Caj. Card. ALOISI-MASELLA, S. R. P. Praef.  
VICENTIUS NUSSI, Secretarius.  
JOANNES PONZI, Substitutus.

---

#### DE FESTO S. JOSEPH RITE TRANSFERENDO.

##### *Decretum Generale S. R. C.*

Postquam anno superiore per Decretum *Urbis et Orbis* festum S. Ioseph Confessoris, Sponsi Deiparae Virginis atque universalis Ecclesiae Patroni, ad ritum duplicem primae classis iampridem evectum, privilegio ditatum fuit translationis in feriam secundam subsequentem quoties illud in Dominicam Passionis inciderit et in feriam quartam post Dominicam in Albis quando die decima nona Martii vel Dominica Palmarum, vel aliqua ex feriis Hebdomadae Maioris occurrit; a nonnullis rei liturgicae peritis Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequens dubium propositum fuit, nimirum: *An festum S. Ioseph, Sponsi B. M. V., quum transfertur in feriam II post Dominicam Passionis, vel ad feriam IV post Dominicam in Albis tanquam in sedem propriam, praeferri debeat tum in occurrence festis primae classis etiam Patroni loci, Titulari et Dedicationis Ecclesiae in praefatis diebus?* Hoc porro dubium quum a me infrascripto Cardinali Sacrae eidem Congregationi Praefecto in Ordinario Coetu, subsignata die ad Vaticanum coadunato, propositum fuerit; Eini ac Rmi Patres sacris tuendis Ritibus praepositi, exquisito voto aliquorum e Rmis Patribus Consultoribus, re mature perpensa, ita rescribere rati sunt videlicet: *Festum S. Ioseph in casu, transferendum ad normam Decretis lati de festo Sanctissimi Cordis Iesu, nempe locum*

*cedat tantummodo Duplicibus primae classis, ceu Dedicationis, ac Titularis Ecclesiae, Patroni, quando haec sub duplici praeecepto fiunt: quibus in casibus, die immediate sequenti illud reponatur.*

Idem etiam statuit Sacra Congregatio pro simili incidentia quod translationem festorum Nativitatis S. Ioannis Baptistae, et Annuntiationis B. Mariae Virginis: suppressis quibuscumque anterioribus decretis diversum, seu contrarium disponentibus. 27 Iunii 1893.

Facta postmodum de his omnibus Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leoni Papae XIII, relatione per me infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae eidem Congregationi Praefectum, Sanctitas Sua sententiam Sacrae ipsius Congregationis in omnibus ratam habuit et confirmavit. Die 2 Iulii, anno eodem.

CAIETANUS Card. ALOISI-MASELLA.

*S. R. C. Praefectus.*

Loco ✠ Sigilli.

VICENTIVS NUSSI.

*S. R. C. Secretarius.*

**INDULG. PRO ANTIPH. S. MICHAEL.**

*(Ex. S. C. Ind. et Rel. 19 Aug. 1893.)*

RESCRIPTUM QUO CONCEDITUR INDULGENTIA CENTUM DIERUM  
RECITANTIBUS ANTIPHONAM: SANCTE MICHAEL.

BEATISSIME PATER :

Pater Laprost, superior Abbatiae e Pontigny dioecesis Senonensis in Gallia, provolutus ad osculum S. Pedis implorat gratiam ut concedatur Indulgentia *Centium dierum* lucranda semel in die ab omnibus fidelibus utriusque sexus, qui corde contrito atque devoto recitaverint antiphonam :

*“Sancte Michael Archangele, defende nos in praelio ut non pereamus in tremendo iudicio.”*

SSmus D. N. Leo PP. XIII in audientia habita die 19 Augusti 1893 ab infrasc. Secr. S. C. Ind. Sacrq. Rel. praepositae benigne annuit pro gratia iuxta preces. Praesente *in perpetuum* valituro, absque ulla Brevis expeditione: contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Secretaria eiusd. S. Cong., die 19 Augusti 1893.

(L. ✠ S.)

ALOYSIVS, Card. SERAFINI, Praef.  
✠ ALEX. Archiep. NIC., Secretarius.



## BOOK-REVIEW.

**LEAD KINDLY LIGHT!** Some Notes for those in search of truth. By the Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton. London: Art and Book Company. (Benziger Bros., New York) 1893. pp, XII., 38.

As a specimen of catechetical literature the above is an ideal publication. It consists of a series of notes logically arranged to set forth the essential characteristics of the true faith of Christ. In a few pages, the exceptional typography of which aids no little to the intelligent appreciation of the subject-matter, Fr. Taunton applies the test of requisite marks to the Roman Catholic Church and to the admitted claims of Protestantism. The contrast is established in so graphic a manner that the unbiased and earnest inquirer after religious truth will, by force of consistency, find himself led to continue the examination of Catholic doctrine. The book is an abstract of instructions given to a convert from Anglicanism, which the latter had preserved in form of notes and placed before two Anglican divines who found no serious answer to make in defence of the creed which they themselves represented. These notes will no doubt prove a kindly light to many sincere souls into whose hands they may fall.

**QUAESTIONES SELECTAE EX THEOLOGIA DOGM.,**  
auctore Dr. Francisco Schmid, Sacrae Theologiae Professore in Seminario Brixinensi. Paderbornae F. Schoeningh. Romae, Typographia de Propag. (Pustet, N. Y.) 1891. pp. VI, 493.

The path of dogmatic theology, like that of every other science, is beset with difficulties. The truths of revelation, amply bright for their divinely-given purpose of lighting man on his journey to eternity, do not explain every problem of the here and the hereafter which the searching intellect would fain have answered. Man has to use his natural faculties in solving doubts. Thus the patient questioning of different minds under the guidance of the Church, the custodian of theological principles, has its results, and the student gleans in the lapse of time what was denied to thinkers of ages past. Such new light in dark places is more likely to be found, *ceteris paribus*, by those who devote themselves to some special domain of dogmatic science, than by those who strive to cover the whole ground. A work, therefore, like the one before us dealing with select questions should be welcome to earnest

students of that science. The subjects taken up are not such as commend themselves to the mere utilitarian, or are by the man of narrow views deemed "practical," but they are those which present peculiar difficulty in the scientific evolution of revealed truth; and as the author well observes *in scientiis omnia intime connexa sunt, ita ut haud raro etiam facilia sine convenienti inquisitione difficiliorum undequaque firma esse nequeunt.*

The first of these questions concerns the various acceptations of God's power. Every tyro in theology is familiar with the distinction *potentia divina absoluta et ordinaria*, a distinction at the root of some of the gravest problems. The terms, however, are not always taken in the same precise meaning by different authors, nor even by the same author in different places. And yet, as Dr. Schmid observes: "*Vix invenitur auctor qui diversitatem istam expresse indicet, multoque minus, qui multiplicem sensum quo haec distinctio a theologis aut revera accipi consuevit aut accipi potest, per omnia dilucide et accurate explicaverit.*" There is good reason, therefore, for the careful criticism to which he has subjected this subject (pp. 11—28).

The presence of angelic spirits in place is a fact attested by many passages of Holy Writ. Motion is intimately connected with location. How extremely difficult it is to apprehend the spirit world in its relation to place is evident from the conflicting statements which the clearest and deepest minds put forth in their efforts to explain it. To reconcile such statements and by all-round study to find more light on the matter has induced the author to treat it at length (pp. 28—154): "*Neque res inutilis apparere debet,*" he says, "*licet enim horum cognitio immediate ad instructionem religiosam et ad vitam christianam parum juvare videatur eadem tamen sine dubio ad hoc inservit ut discrimen inter Deum et spiritum creatum in majori luce collocetur*" (p. 29).

How can the fire of hell act on the fallen spirits and lost souls? The question obtrudes itself on even the most superficial inquirer, but few have been able to give a satisfactory answer. The various opinions are examined by our author, and what appears to him the true solution is ably defended: *Daemones in suae praevaricationis poenam verum adustionis dolorem patiuntur idque per ignem tanquam per physicum divinae vindictae instrumentum.* How such a theory is compatible with a spiritual nature is shown by great wealth of argument based largely upon the psychology of pain in the human compound (145—229).

Around the fallen state of man and the suppositional state of pure nature many difficulties cluster, especially as to the effects of original sin, the way it has influenced man's natural powers, its punishment hereafter, the necessity of Redemption, etc. Of these and kindred subjects the author has made a deep and satisfactory study.

The question of the essence of the hypostatic union is one that has tried the acumen of the best theologians. Should we with Knoll call it *exigui momenti*, or with Lessius *magni momenti ad intelligentiam mysterii Incarnationis*? Dr. Schmid admits that in catechetical instruction, and even in an elementary course of theology, the subject has no importance but *pro intima intelligentia et scientifica ac speculativa expositio mysterii Incarnationis haud levis momenti est*. The Divine Word assumed a human nature bereft of human personality, what was lacking *esse humano Christi physice loquendo ut hoc esse in se personam humanam non constituat*? Was it something real as opposed to *merum ens rationis*, something in *ipsis rebus physice fundatum*? If so, something positive or negative, and to what category of being is it reducible? The student who will carefully weigh the solution of these questions will realize how much light they throw not only on the sublime mystery itself, but on our ontological concept of *nature and person*.

We are absolutely certain that our Lord assumed with our nature its *infirmities*, such at least as do not conflict with His supreme moral perfection. Under these infirmities are ranked death, bodily suffering, such as hunger, thirst, sense of cold, etc., and mental suffering, fear, sadness, etc. *At non eodem modo liquet quatenus hae fragilitates Christo Domino necessariae vel naturales et quatenus voluntariae vel liberae fuerint*. The question is at once important and difficult. Important, because helping the mind toward a deep appreciation of our Lord's infinite love for His atoning work; difficult, because of His Divine personality and the perfection of His human nature. Our author searches the matter thoroughly and one cannot but admit that his reasoning tends not only to enlighten the mind, but to warm the heart with love for Him who so willingly "bore our infirmities and carried our sorrows."

So much for the subject matter of our work. In its development the author is true to his aim to present only *quid magis veritati consentaneum videatur*. The reader will not find a long array of authorities, names or schools, nor a catena of excerpts from other writers, old or new. Credit is of course given to the pertinent authors in the various themes discussed, but there is little save intrinsic argu-

ment in the book. The whole trend of criticism is thoroughly objective, both as to matter and form. The work is not to be taken up in order to while away a passing hour, nor will it respond to the "dipping" process, nor even to steady reading. It demands study. But like all good books it will repay the labor given to it, not only in the stimulating of vigorous thought, but by a deeper insight and more conscious grasp of sublimest truth, for, better is, as Aristotle says, a little knowledge of noble things, than much knowledge of the less noble : *magis concupiscimus scire modicum de rebus honorabilioribus et altissimis etiam si topice et probabiliter illud sciamus, quam scire multum et per certitudinem de rebus minus nobilibus.*

The author hints that on the reception accorded the present volume will depend his issuing another series of selected questions. It would prove advantageous therefore to the science, if lovers of theology would give the work a generous welcome.

**FIVE MINUTE SERMONS** for Low Masses on all Sundays of the year. By Priests of the Congregation of St. Paul. Vol. 1.—New York: The Catholic Book Exchange. 1893.

These sermons are not only short, as the title indicates, but practical and couched in proper language, suitable especially for the class of people who attend early Masses on Sundays. The epistles and gospels are prefixed for each Sunday so that the injunction of the third Plenary Council, according to which the people are to receive a short instruction on the gospel, if possible at every Mass, can easily be carried out by either reading or delivering from memory one of the "Five Minute Sermons."

**MANUAL OF BIBLICAL GEOGRAPHY.** A Text-book on Bible History, especially prepared for the use of students and teachers of the Bible and for Sunday-school instruction, containing Maps, Plans, Review Charts, Colored Diagrams, and illustrated with accurate views of the principal cities and localities known to Bible History. By Rev. J. L. Hurlbut, D.D. With an introduction by Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D.—Chicago: Rand, McNally & Company. Quarto. Pp. IX, 158. Pr. \$2.75.

The geographical charts of Rand, McNally & Co. have earned for their publishers an enviable reputation in point of accuracy and mechanical finish, and this new edition of the Manual of Biblical Geography, confirms the general impression.

Catholic Scripture classes, however, can hardly avail themselves of such excellences when coupled with distinctly Protestant features of the Bible translation, even where these are of a subordinate character and sparingly used. The form of Hebrew proper names introduced by Luther into his translation of the Bible was to a great extent discarded by the makers of the King James version, but still numerous instances have been retained in the English Protestant Bible which give evidence that the desire of reform was largely influenced by a desire to differ from the established Catholic usage. The translators of the "Reformation" period, so called, followed what they considered the Hebrew orthography and phonetism, for which they had, of course, to rely in great part upon the authority of the Masoretic school, which undertook to give to the Hebrew Scripture language an organized form, nearly a thousand years after the Septuagint rabbins had made their version from the original Hebrew. The Catholic translation (Vulgate) has unswervingly adhered to the Septuagint form of proper names which had the sanction of the Jews for nearly three hundred years before our Lord's time, and which St. Jerome (who lived in Palestine and made his translation with the assistance of a learned rabbi, more than eleven hundred years ere Luther introduced his novelty under the plea of a new translation from the original Hebrew) has confirmed as accepted by Jews and Christians of at least the first four centuries of the present era.

The statement (p. 108) that the Transfiguration of our Lord took place on Mt. Hermon can hardly be justified by exact criticism. Here, too, Catholic tradition proves to be a much safer guide than the surmises of some recent travelers. Origen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Jerome, who represent the best biblical scholarship of the early Christian centuries are unanimous in assigning Mt. Tabor as the place of the occurrence. The distance between Caesarea Philippi and this mountain is about twenty hours, which could easily be made in the six days mentioned by the Evangelist. Fr. Maas in his "Life of Jesus" calls, moreover, attention to the fact that, on descending from the mountain, our Lord is introduced into the midst of the Scribes questioning His disciples. This could not have occurred in the neighborhood of Mt. Hermon in the north of Palestine, but was very likely in the district of the plain of Esdraelon, within easy reach of Nazareth and the neighboring towns. We notice that the writer of the introduction to this "Manual" gives countenance to the same erroneous assumption (p. vii).

ARISTOTELES-LEXICON. Erklaerung der philosophischen termini technici des Aristoteles, in alphabetischer Reihenfolge. Von Dr. Matthias Kappes. Acad. Munster. — Paderborn: Ferd. Schoeningh, 1894. — Pp. 70.

To say that the revival in our day of scholastic philosophy is doomed to be a failure, betokens an utter ignorance of the activity in philosophical circles during the last decade. Not only do the Catholic leaders of intellectual advance labor vigorously to reform the art of thinking upon the plan of its ancient integrity and surety, but superior minds everywhere show themselves eager to co-operate in the movement of combating the lax methods of reasoning which have become the source of a thousand intellectual heresies and a general skepticism on moral grounds, despite the newly furnished and ever increasing accessions from the domains of scientific progress and empiric knowledge. A common meeting ground, where all earnest thinkers may learn to understand themselves and each other, is the study of Aristotle. The "Summa" of St. Thomas Aquinas would be an impossibility without the preparatory labors of the Stagirite whose teaching the Angelic Doctor loves to introduce everywhere in the pages of his vast philosophical collection by the words—"the Philosopher says." The robust intellectual work done in Germany during the present century is largely traceable to the fostering of Aristotelian studies in higher literary circles. The number of critical editions of the Opera Aristotelis, among which that published by the Royal Academy of Prussia, with the *Index Aristotelicus* by Bonitz, deserves special mention, together with various commentaries in Greek, Latin and German, fills many pages of a good sized catalogue.

But the study of Aristotle, even if we abstract from the wide field over which his careful and prolific investigations range, is an arduous task, especially at the outset. One of the principal difficulties is the peculiarity of his terminology. This of itself precludes the possibility of a mere reading of Aristotle, even in translation, as one might profitably read a modern classic. The student of St. Thomas is prepared for this difficulty by a special training in Logic and Metaphysics. But the lay philosopher requires a commentary which will make him familiar with the exact meaning of terms, familiar perchance to the ear, but widely different from the signification given them by a later usage.

The needed help in such a case has been supplied by the Aristo-

teles-Lexicon, which gives the student a convenient key for the interpretation of all technical terms to be found not only in the Organon and Metaphysics, but likewise in the Ethics and Politics, in the Auscultationes Physicae and kindred works on physics, in the Dialogues and Hypomnematic writings of the man who was at once pupil and master of the "divine" Plato.

Dr. Kappes shows throughout in his definitions and interpretations of Aristotelian terms that fine discrimination which stamps the work of the practical philosopher and pedagogue. This may be assumed in the case of those who are familiar with the scholastic terminology as taught in the "Summa" and in Catholic philosophy to-day; hence we need not enter into specific illustration of the booklet before us.

**THE DIVINE ARMORY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE, BY  
Rev. Kenelm Vaughan. American Edition Revised.—  
Catholic Book Exchange; New York, 1894, p. xxviii, 928.**

Though following too closely on the recent Encyclical of the Holy Father to be regarded as in any way conditioned by the Papal pronouncement, this manual is none the less the expression of the thought and desire of the Church, and consequently of her Supreme Head, that the Holy Scriptures in their letter as well as in their essence and spirit should color the minds and hearts of her children, clergy and laity. As such the book is not intended to be a guide in the ways of the "higher criticism," but to lead the diligent and devout searcher into a broader and deeper understanding of the Divine Message, both in its entirety and detail. Its title happily suggests its character and purpose. It opens out the "Armory" of Holy Scriptures, showing the inquirer where to find "the shield of faith," "the helmet of salvation," "the sword of the Spirit," the truths we should believe concerning his beginning and end, the laws and rules of right conduct, the type and guide of his being and life. There are other books of this kind in our language, notably Fr. Lambert's translation of Merz's *Thesaurus Biblicus*; but whilst the latter is intended as a handbook of reference, and retains the general features of a dictionary, the present manual may be regarded more as a systematic compendium of theological principals. The primary truths of theology found in the Written Word are not simply the seeds whence the husbandman trained in such fields gathers the golden harvest of scientific theology. They constitute that Divine Wisdom which sets the believer's mind aright in all its

bearings, and helps to form his will and heart after the "Model shown on the Mount." The merit of the book consists in this, that it gathers together according to the broad plan of God's dealing with men, a systematized arrangement of the truths of religion, theoretical and practical, dogmatic, moral and ascetical. Based upon the *Theologia Scripturae Divinae* of Fr. Marcellius, it has retained the essential plan of that excellent little work, extending, however, its range and expanding its contents. In common with other books of its kind it will be to the priest a convenient source of reference for the scriptural truths bearing on every point of faith. Its general plan and the introductions prefixed to each of its main divisions, will suggest outlines of series of discourses on the truths of salvation, whilst its summaries of all the pertinent passages of Holy Writ will afford an abundance of most precious material for development. As a guide too, in meditation and spiritual reading it will be useful, not only to the clergy, but to all who seek to strengthen their souls on the sound food of the divine word, nor must we omit to mention that the convenient attractive form in which the book has been produced should commend it as a *Vade Mecum* to all who love the sacred truth it presents.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

**A TREATISE OF SPIRITUAL LIFE**, leading man by an easy and clear method from the commencement of conversion to the very summit of sanctity. Translated from the Latin of Mgr. Ch. J. Morozzo, Cistercian Abb. and Bishop of Bobbio; by Rev. D. A. Donovan, O. Cist.—Poplar Bluff, Mo. : Published by the Author, 1893.

**EIN BLUETHENSTRAUSS VON LIEDERN U. GEDICHTEN** dem Hochw. Herrn Heinrich Muehlsiepen, zu seinem Silbernen Jubilaem als General Vicar gewidmet von Mitgliedern des Clerus der Erzdiocese St. Louis. 27 Juni, 1893.—Office of the *Amerika*: St. Louis, Mo.

**MANUAL OF THE ARCHCONFRATERNITY OF PERPETUAL ADORATION**, under the patronage of St. Benedict, for the Relief of Suffering Souls in Purgatory. St. John's University *Record* Print, Collegeville, Minn., 1893.

**DER HAUSFREUND**. Illustr. Familien-Kalender 1894. Verlag des "Volksfreund," Buffalo, N. Y. Muehlbauer u Behrle, Chicago, Ill.



# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.—MARCH, 1894.—NO. 3.

---

**THE MOSAIC HEXAEMERON IN THE LIGHT OF EXEGESIS AND  
MODERN SCIENCE.**

**MOSES AND SCIENCE.**

**P**PROMINENT, if not chief, among the questions that from time immemorial have engaged the attention of mankind are those pertaining to the origin and constitution of this world of ours. All nations and all peoples, with the exception of those in the lowest scale of intelligence, have had their peculiar theories regarding geogony and cosmogony, to which they have clung with greater or less tenacity. Some of these theories were very elaborately worked out and contained many elements of truth; others, on the contrary, were absurd and ridiculous in the extreme, and afford us the most striking evidence possible regarding the simplicity of the people who accepted them, and their utter ignorance of the commonest laws and phenomena of nature.

According to the Sandwich Islanders all was originally a vast ocean. It was then that an immense bird deposited on the waters an egg from which arose the islands of Hawaii. But this idea of a world-egg is not peculiar to the Hawaiians. It obtains among the Polynesians generally and has prevailed among many peoples of the Old World as well. We find special prominence given to it in the Ordinances of Menu, wherein the Hindu cosmogony is developed at length. Brahma, the progenitor of all the worlds, was, we are informed, born from a golden egg. In this egg the supreme power remained for a divine year. Each one of the three hundred and sixty days of this divine year was equal to 12,000,000 of our years. After this long period the cosmic egg broke, and from its fragments were formed the heavens and the earth, the atmosphere and the abyss of waters.

The earth, according to the *Shastras*, "is a circular plain, resembling a water-lily. Its circumference is four hundred millions of miles. It is borne upon the backs of eight huge elephants; the elephants stand upon the back of an immense tortoise, and the tortoise upon a thousand-headed serpent. Whenever the serpent becomes drowsy and nods, an earthquake is produced. . . . The earth consists of seven concentric oceans and as many continents. They are arranged in regard to each other like the waves produced by throwing a pebble into water. The first ocean, the one nearest the centre, is filled with salt water, the second with milk, the third with the curds of milk, the fourth with melted butter, the fifth with the juice of the sugar-cane, the sixth with wine, and the seventh with fresh water. Beyond the seventh ocean is a land of pure gold, but inaccessible to man; and far beyond that extends the land of darkness, containing places of torment for the wicked.

"The continent at the centre of the earth is 250,000 miles in diameter. From its centre, Mount Meru, composed entirely of gold and precious stones, rises to a height of 600,000 miles. Unlike all other mountains it is much the largest at the top. It is crowned with three golden summits, which are the favorite residences of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva. Near these summits are the heavens of many of the inferior gods. One of them is described as being 800 miles in circumference and 40 miles in height. Its dome is supported by pillars composed of diamonds, its numerous palaces are of pure gold, and it is so ornamented with brilliant gems, that its splendor exceeds the brightness of twelve suns."<sup>1</sup>

On the western slope of Mount Meru are found beautiful stretches of country, in which men, who are of the color of gold, live to the age of 10,000 or 12,000 years.

According to Mahavharata, "The beings on the earth are divided into two classes—the animate and the inanimate. The animals constitute fourteen species, seven of which—monkeys, bears, elephants, buffaloes, wild boars, tigers and lions—are wild in the forests; whilst seven others—men,

<sup>1</sup> Historic Incidents and Life in India, by Caleb Wright, and J. A. Brainerd, pp. 26-27.

sheep, goats, cows, horses, asses and mules—live with men in towns. Man is the first of domestic animals; the lion is the first of savage animals. 'There are five species of plants.'<sup>1</sup>

In the time of Homer, about 900 B. C., it was believed that the earth, surrounded by the river Oceanus, filled the lower half of the sphere of the world, whilst its upper half extended aloft; that Helios, the sun, extinguished his fires every evening and re-lighted them the following morning, after having immersed himself in the deep waters of the ocean.

Thales and the Stoics, and those of their school, were informed by Plutarch, taught that the earth is spherical, like a ball; Anaximander maintained that it was in the form of a stone column. Many fancied it to have the form of a cube, and to be attached by its four corners to the vault of the firmament. Others, among them Leucippus, imagined it to have the shape of a drum, while others still declared it to be a disc, protected by the river Oceanus, or guarded by a serpent which encircled it. Epicurus, who accepted the popular belief, taught that the stars were extinguished when they set and relighted when they rose again; that the earth is held in place by cords or ligaments, just as the head is connected with the neck or trunk. To explain the revolution of the heavenly bodies, Anaximander taught that they were fixed in crystal spheres. Anaximenes, a disciple of Anaximander, maintained that the earth is flat like a table. He likewise held the same view regarding the sun. In accordance with the generally accepted opinion of his age, he thought that the stars were fixed like nails in a solid revolving sphere, which was invisible by reason of its transparency. In order to account for the peculiar motions of the sun, moon and planets, Pythagoras devised his famous theory of *eccentrics and epicycles*,<sup>2</sup> a theory that, at a later date, was adopted and developed by Ptolemy and accepted as the true explanation of planetary movements until the time of Copernicus. To meet new difficulties presented by the peculiar motions of the

<sup>1</sup> Barthelemy Saint-Hilaire, in the *Journal des Savants*, Jan., 1868, pp. 33-34.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Histoire de l'Astronomie*, par Ferdinand Hofer, p. 107.

sun, moon and planets, Eudoxus, of Cnidus, increased the number of crystal spheres to twenty-six. But these spheres, which were regarded as so many heavens, arranged one inside of the other, were not yet sufficiently numerous to account for the many and varied motions of the planets. The number was therefore augmented until astronomers recognized no fewer than fifty-six of these solid, revolving, invisible, transparent spheres.

Plato regarded the heavenly bodies as animated beings. The world, according to him, was but an animal, and its spherical form was the type of perfection. "The Creator," he tells us in the *Timæus*, "gave to the world the figure which was suitable and also natural. Now to the animal which was to comprehend all animals, that figure was suitable which comprehends within itself all other figures. Wherefore he made the world in the form of a globe, round as from a lathe, having its extremes in every direction equi-distant from the centre, the most perfect and the most like itself of all figures; for he considered that the like is infinitely fairer than the unlike. This he finished off, making the surface smooth all round for many reasons; in the first place, because the living being had no need of eyes when there was nothing remaining outside him to be seen; nor of ears when there was nothing to be heard; and there was no surrounding atmosphere to be breathed; nor would there have been any use of organs by the help of which he might receive his food or get rid of what he had already digested, since there was nothing which went from him or came into him; for there was nothing beside him. Of design he was created thus, his own waste providing his own food, and all that he did or suffered taking place in and by himself. For the Creator conceived that a being which was self-sufficient would be far more excellent than one which lacked anything; and, as he had no need to take anything or defend himself against anyone, the Creator did not think it necessary to bestow upon him hands, nor had he any need of feet, nor of the whole apparatus of walking; but the movement suited to his spherical form was assigned to him, being of all the seven that which is most appropriate to mind and intelligence;

and he was made to move in the same manner and on the same spot, within his own limits revolving in a circle. All the other six motions were taken away from him, and he was made not to partake of their deviations. And as this circular movement required no feet, the universe was created without legs and without feet."

The foregoing theories of geogony and cosmogony are sufficient to show how hopelessly at sea even the greatest philosophers have been regarding the origin and constitution of the world. It were easy to adduce numerous other similar theories, but space forbids. We look upon them all as childish and absurd, and justly so. Nothing could be more preposterous according to our views of nature than some of the cosmogonic notions entertained by the philosophers of Greece and India. Even the "divine Plato," did not, as we have seen, escape falling into the most ridiculous conceptions of the universe. True it is, that most of the theories mentioned were formulated in the infancy of science. Their authors had not at their disposal the delicate instruments of precision which now enable the physicist and astronomer to solve with ease many of the problems which the sages of antiquity tackled in vain. Being deprived of the geographical knowledge which is now ours, we need not be surprised that they entertained the most erroneous and foolish ideas respecting the form and size of the earth and the creatures which inhabit it. Chemistry was then unknown, and geology was not thought of until some thousands of years later. Fancy was substituted for fact, and the most extravagant vagaries were seriously offered in lieu of sober truth.

Contrast we now the cosmogonical fantasies and speculations of even the most eminent exponents of ancient Hindu and Greek thought, with a system of cosmogony which dates back as far as—if not farther than—any of those of which I have spoken.

"In the beginning," says Moses, "God created heaven and earth." How simple, and yet how sublime! By a *fiat* of omnipotence, by a mere act of his will—not with a

*thought*, as the Hindus taught—God created the world and all that is in it, from nothing.

The first chapter of Genesis so impressed the great pagan rhetorician, Longinus, that he declared: "The legislator of the Jews, who was not an ordinary man, having strongly conceived the greatness and power of God, expressed it in all its dignity at the beginning of his laws, in these words: God said, let light be, and it was; let the earth be made, and the earth was made." Reflecting on the same sublime declarations of Genesis, the illustrious scientist and scholar, Ampère, did not hesitate to affirm: "Either Moses possessed as extensive a knowledge of the sciences as we now have, or he was inspired." "The first page of the Mosaic account of creation," declares Jean Paul, "is of greater import than all the ponderous tomes of naturalists and philosophers." It gives us the first clear statement of creation by an Almighty and self-existent Being, and furnishes us views of God and His creatures that are quite different from those which are at the foundation of the mythologies and false philosophical systems of the ancient world.

But the "Mosaic idea of creation—an idea to which the sages of India, Greece and Rome never attained—is something with which we have been familiar from our infancy, and for this reason we do not attach the importance we otherwise should to the inspired words of Genesis." If, however, we give but a cursory examination to the pagan ideas which prevailed on the subject of creation among the peoples of Egypt, Phœnicia and Babylon, at the time of Moses, and even long afterwards—for the religion of Brahma still affords us a striking instance in point—"We shall," says Haneberg, "realize the full importance of the Mosaic dogma regarding God, the world and man." In Genesis is an entire suppression "of that irrational theory, so generally accepted in antiquity, of a divine being who was a slave to fate, and who acted only through necessity or caprice. In it is banished the terrible apprehension of a blind tyranny of chance; of a maleficent power, the enemy of man; or of other similar phantoms that weighed down upon paganism like a mountain.

Delivered from these vain fears, man may look at creation and heaven with confidence, because he knows that a personal God, living and powerful, is the Creator of the Universe."<sup>1</sup>

"The Mosaic cosmogony alone," declares Delitzsch, in his *Commentary on Genesis*,<sup>2</sup> "proposes to us the idea of a creation from nothing, without eternal matter and without the intervention of any intermediate being or demiurge. Paganism, it is true, permits us to catch a glimpse of this idea, but it is much obscured. Pagan cosmogonies either suppose pre-existing matter, that is, dualism, or they substitute emanation for creation, and then fall into pantheism."

Even such a rationalist as Dillman, when speaking of the cosmogony of Genesis, is forced to confess that "It does not contain a single word which is unworthy of the thought of God. From the moment an attempt was made to portray, in language intelligible to man, the work of creation, something that will ever remain a mystery to us, it has been impossible to outline a picture which is grander or more worthy. With reason, then, does one see in it a proof of its revealed character. Only there where God had manifested Himself could He be delineated. It is the work of the Spirit of Revelation."<sup>3</sup>

Contrasting the cosmogonies of the ancient Pagan world with that of Genesis, the illustrious Donoso Cortes truthfully observes that "in spite of marked differences, they all have this in common, that they exhibit an infinite disproportion between the principle, the mean and the end; between the agent, the act and the work; between the Creator, the act, His creation and the creature. In all of them the universe . . . is superior in dignity and beauty to the Creator who made it by His will; to the agent of which it was the work and the principle which gave it being. This should not surprise us when we consider that the universe is a creation of God, whilst its Creator, according to all these cosmogonic

1 *Geschichte der bibl. Offenbarung*, p. 12.

2 P. 71.

3 Genesis, p. 9.

systems, was a creation of men. What wonder then if the work of the Creator was superior to the work of the creature? . . . Where shall we find a man who, being part of the universe, is able to form a conception of a God who is greater than the universe, if he be not inspired by God? . . . Who can such an one be, if it is not Moses?"<sup>1</sup>

But Moses is not satisfied with the simple declaration that God in the beginning created heaven and earth. He descends to details. He tells us that all that exists, all that we can see, all creatures, the sun, the moon and the stars, the fishes of the sea, the birds of the air, the animals that roam the earth, the flowers that delight the eye, the fruits that are grateful to the taste, man—the lord of creation—are the works of God. And because they are the works of God he also tells us that "God saw that it was good."

And the reason for these detailed and explicit declarations is manifest. The Hebrew people had lived among idolaters and were surrounded by people who gave divine worship to many of God's creatures. He wished to impress upon their minds that neither the sun, nor the moon, nor the stars, neither any animal, nor the earth which affords it nourishment nor any of the elements are God, as was supposed by the Sabianism of the Orient, especially of Chaldea; by the worship of animals in Egypt, by the divine honors paid to the earth by the Romans, Pelasgians and Germans, and by the cult of the fire-worshippers of Greece and Persia. All these things, the objects of the adoration of the heathen, are the works of God. There is no power opposed to God which is equal to Him. Neither is matter, as such, according to the later opinions of the Platonists, the seat of evil. Everything is the work of God, and everything, therefore, is good.<sup>2</sup>

From the foregoing it is manifest that the prime object of the Mosaic narrative, like that of all revelation, was a religious one. "The Gospels," says St. Augustine, "do not tell us that our Lord said: "I will send you the Holy Ghost; to

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Padre Mir in his learned work, *La Creacion* p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hettinger's *Apologie des Christenthums*, Chap. iv, Vol. 3.



teach you the course of the sun and moon; we should endeavor to become Christians and not astronomers." So it is with the Mosaic account of creation. Its purport is not to teach geology, physics, zoology, or astronomy, but to affirm in the most simple and direct manner the creative act of God and His sovereignty over all creatures. Its object is not to anticipate any of the truths of science or philosophy, but to guard the chosen people of God against the pernicious errors and idolatrous practices which were then everywhere prevalent.

The Holy Father, in his recent admirable Encyclical on the Study of the S. Scriptures, clearly brings out this idea when he says: "It must be borne in mind, first of all, that the sacred writers, or rather the Spirit of God which spoke through them, deemed it inadvisable to teach men these things, that is the inner constitution of visible objects, since this conduces in no wise to salvation; and accordingly these writers, instead of entering into an investigation of nature, sometimes described and explained things in a certain figurative style, or in ordinary language such as is employed among men, even of deep learning, at the present day."

All the cosmogonies of the ancient world—that of Moses excepted—were, as we have seen, erroneous not only in the false views they gave of God, but also in the notions which they displayed of nature and her laws. One and all they have long since been rejected by science as ridiculous and absurd. Not so, however, with the cosmogony of Genesis. The more closely it has been examined in the light of the science of these latter days, the more has it been found to harmonize in the most remarkable manner with the latest results of scientific investigation. The words of the great Cuvier, who wrote in the early part of the century, are as true now as when they were first penned—"Moses has left us," says the illustrious naturalist, "a cosmogony, the exactitude of which is daily verified in the most admirable manner. Recent geological observations are in perfect accord with Genesis regarding the order of appearance of the various forms of organized beings."

Again, God not only created the world out of nothing, but He gave it its present form during a succession of epochs. According to Genesis, as well as according to science, He first created primitive, nebulous matter, and after a long, indefinite period of time He fashioned from this matter, "without form," all the myriad forms of the organic and inorganic worlds. And, according to Genesis as well as according to science, the Creator proceeded from the simpler to the more complex. He first created light, without which organic development, as we know it, is impossible. He then separated the earth from the waters of the ocean and prepared it for the abode of terrestrial life. Plant life precedes animal life in the scheme of creation and the waters of the deep are peopled before the dry land is inhabited. In both the vegetable and animal kingdoms the lower forms of life precede the higher. The culmination of the work of creation was man, whose apparition, according to both revelation and science, was posterior to that of all other creatures.

Here we have in a few lines a resumé of some of the most important conclusions of modern science respecting the origin of the earth and its inhabitants. And the Mosaic account, be it remembered, was written long before any attention was given to the natural or physical sciences and many thousand years before geology, paleontology and astronomy had achieved those triumphs which will render this nineteenth century of ours forever memorable.

And not only this. Moses makes statements in his narrative that were for many long ages regarded as contrary to science and philosophy, declares truths which, humanly speaking, could not have been known before an exhaustive study had been made of the past life of our globe, and before the telescope and the spectroscope had given us the knowledge we now possess concerning the origin and constitution of the material universe.

What Moses declared in the infancy of our race and what science now affirms not only was not accepted as true in the earlier ages of the world but it was rejected as positively erroneous. The various profane cosmogonies that obtained

from time to time among divers peoples were against it. Philosophers descried it as contrary to the teachings of science, and rationalists and unbelievers fancied they discovered in its supposed contradictions an argument against the inspiration and authenticity of the Sacred Record. But as Genesis was more carefully scrutinized and as science advanced, it was found that a remarkable harmony existed between the two, and that far from being contradictory they both told the same story, although in different languages. The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable. There is something in Genesis above man—something supernatural—something divine. In a word, Moses was inspired. In the words of Linnaeus: "It is materially demonstrated that he did not write and could not write except under the inspiration of the author of nature—*neutiquam suo ingenio sed altiori ductu.*"

I would not, however, have it inferred from what has been said that there are no difficulties in Genesis, or that I am disposed to underrate their magnitude. Far from it. What I do maintain and insist on is that there is nothing in the Mosaic cosmogony that is contrary to any of the certain truths of science. Scientific theories without number have been formulated which were contrary to the teachings of the Mosaic narrative, but theories are not science. In the last century, especially, as well as during the present one, many of these hostile theories were based on geology and paleontology. "From the time of Buffon," wrote Cardinal Wiseman, more than fifty years ago, "system rose beside system, like the moving pillars of the desert, advancing in threatening array; but, like them, they were fabrics of sand; and though in 1806 the French Institute could count more than eighty such theories, hostile to Scripture, not one of them has stood still, or deserves to be recorded."<sup>1</sup>

And more than this. All sorts of extravagant interpretations have been given to the first chapter of Genesis, some of which were even more absurd than the scientific speculations of which I have just spoken. But such commentaries are no

1 *Science and Revealed Religion*. Vol. I, p. 268.

more to be accepted as the last word on the Mosaic narrative than are the hypotheses and fantasies of scientists to be regarded as veritable science. That such theories and interpretations are discordant and contradictory is no evidence whatever of any discrepancy between the Mosaic cosmogony and the logical deductions from the known facts of science. Theories and conjectures may be at variance with one another, but science and the word of God, never.

I have said that I have no disposition to minimize the difficulties of the Mosaic narrative of creation, nor have I. I think one may safely assert that no one chapter in the Bible contains so many and so great difficulties as does the first chapter of Genesis. On no single chapter, probably, have the Fathers and schoolmen and commentators expended more time and learning, and in no instance have they exhibited a wider divergence of views than when endeavoring to explain this self-same chapter, and reconcile certain of its declarations with the known or supposed teachings of profane science.

And just here it may be observed that we could have no better illustration of the perfect liberty of thought enjoyed by the children of the Church, in all matters outside of positive dogma, than that afforded by the diversity of views entertained by saints and doctors respecting the true meaning of many controverted passages of the Mosaic cosmogony. Commentators have endeavored to accommodate the declarations of the Hebrew law-giver to the scientific notions of their time, and, as a consequence, we have in their interpretations a faithful reflex of all the speculations and vagaries that have at one time or another been put forth as genuine science. We often hear it said that believers in dogma and the Bible—especially Catholics—are so hampered by restrictions of all kinds that they are ever in a condition of intellectual thralldom. We are told that there are many questions in science that we, as Catholics, may not investigate, much less discuss, and that our religious beliefs forbid us to accept many of the demonstrated truths of science. I wish here and now to record in the most emphatic manner

possible a formal and explicit denial of each and every one of these imputations, and to declare that they are utterly without foundation in fact. The example of the Fathers and schoolmen, and the commentators of every age of the Church, gives the lie to such foolish declarations. In everything outside of revealed truth and the doctrinal teaching of the Church they have shown us that they were ever permitted the greatest degree of latitude in exegesis, and that they always enjoyed the greatest possible measure of intellectual freedom. They recognized all along that the prime object of the Bible is to save souls, and not to teach science; that its main purpose is, in the language of Cardinal Baronius, "to teach us how to go to heaven, and not how the heavens go." The learned Catholic historian and Orientalist, François Lenormant, expresses the same idea when he declares that the object of Scripture is not to inform us as to "how the things of the earth go, and what vicissitudes follow one another here below. The Holy Spirit has not been concerned with the revelation of scientific truths or with universal history. In such matters 'He has abandoned the world to the disputes of men'—*tradidit mundum disputationibus eorum.*"<sup>1</sup> In questions, then, of chronology, biology, astronomy, geology, ethnology and anthropology we must have recourse to reason and research, to observation and experiment. Induction and not revelation must be our guide in all such matters, except—and this is very rarely the case—when a certain and incontrovertible statement of fact in matters of science is made by the Sacred Text itself. The specific unity of the human race—taught both by the Bible and the Church—is a case in point.

It is a grave mistake, therefore, to regard the Bible, especially the first two chapters of Genesis, as a compendium of science, as so many have done. For, as Cardinal Newman observes, "it seems unworthy of the divine greatness that the Almighty should, in the revelation of Himself to us, undertake mere secular duties, and assume the office of a

1 *The Beginnings of History*. Preface.

narrator, as such, or an historian, or geographer, except in so far as the secular matters bear directly upon the revealed truth.”

Catholics who have a correct knowledge of the teachings of their faith will not admit that they are in any way hampered in the pursuit of science by the exigencies of dogma. On the contrary, they claim and enjoy, in the truest sense of the word, the greatest mental freedom, a freedom that truth alone can give—a freedom that those who are outside the pale of the Church know not of—the freedom of the children of God.

In the case of a Catholic, “it is not,” as Very Rev. Father Ryder truthfully remarks, “so much his freedom of investigation as his freedom from investigation that is controlled. He is bound to be rigid and exacting in his scientific method, to maintain cautiously all the reserves of doubt. He is precluded from that facile abandonment to the prevailing wind of doctrine which is so characteristic of our modern scientific world.” . . . A Catholic man of science may be a specialist, but he is bound to be—nay, he can hardly fail to be—something more. He must know something of all the territories of science, their outlines at least, for he has a theology which is more than co-extensive with them all and which has a word to say of each, though it be only, as is commonly the case, to assure the student that here he is within his right, and that his way is clear.”<sup>1</sup>

The faith of Catholics, consequently, far from restricting their liberty of research, gives it a vivifying principle which it could not otherwise possess. And far from circumscribing their views of nature, or giving them false notions of the laws and phenomena of the material world, it extends their horizon, and illumines the field of their investigation with a brilliance all its own. The mistake made by many in denying to Catholics liberty of thought in the study of science, is that they confound liberty with license. Revealed truth and dogma never do and never can conflict with science; neither

<sup>1</sup> *The Proper Attitude of Catholics Towards Modern Bible Criticism*, in the *Catholic World*, June 1893, pp. 405, et seq.

are they incompatible with the most perfect intellectual freedom. They are, however, incompatible with intellectual license. They save the Catholic scientist from many errors into which those who are not guided by religious truth inevitably fall; they shield him from the blasts of false doctrine which the Eolus of error is ever sending forth from his cave, and enable him to steer clear both of the Scylla of ignorance and superstition on the one hand, and the Charybdis of agnosticism and materialism on the other. They protect him from flighty speculations which always issue in discomfiture. They hold him to the *terra firma* of true science, and, thus like Hercules, he is able to vanquish the Antaeus of fallacy and hallucination with comparative ease.

But let us now turn our attention to the teaching of the various schools of exegesis that have existed in diverse periods of the Church's history. A brief resumé of what they have severally taught will be not only interesting but instructive from several points of view. It will confirm what has been said concerning the liberty of thought accorded the children of the Church respecting matters outside of faith and dogma. It will show that while entertaining diverse and even contradictory opinions in matters of science, the Fathers and Doctors were always of one mind in everything that appertained to faith and revealed truth. And more than this; it will prove conclusively something that is generally ignored, if not entirely unknown, and that is that some of the grandest conceptions and generalizations attributed to modern scientists are in reality due to the early Greek and Latin Fathers. Most people are wont to credit to contemporary science much that belongs to Tradition and the School, and this because they have been taught to believe that all the ideas of the earlier commentators of Genesis were fantastical and contrary to the results of modern scientific researches. Even the cursory examination that we shall be able to make of the cosmogonic views of some of the Church's Doctors, especially St. Gregory and St. Augustine, will, I trust, effectively dispel these erroneous notions— notions which have so long obtained, even among those who

should know better—and demonstrates beyond any possibility of doubt, that we have in some of the Fathers, especially the two just named, the precursors of the most illustrious exponents of a true theory of the visible universe and of evolution of the various forms of terrestrial life. We shall find that they have anticipated the noble conceptions of Descartes, Laplace and Herschel, and expressed them in words that cannot be misunderstood. And we shall likewise learn that they have laid down principles which are in perfect accord with the latest and most approved theories regarding the origin and constitution of the universe, and the development of the manifold forms of animal and vegetable life. I do not mean by this to assert that they had anything approaching the knowledge we now possess of the natural and physical sciences, because they had not. But what I do affirm, and this I shall insist on, because it is capable of the completest demonstration, is, that they had a clear conception of the nature of some of the most profound problems of science, with which the human mind has ever grappled, and which even now cannot be said to have received a complete solution. But more of this as we proceed.

JOHN A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

*University of Notre Dame, Indiana.*

---

#### ALLEGORISM AND LITERALISM.

One of the greatest difficulties in the interpretation of the Mosaic account of creation turns on the meaning to be assigned to the word *day*. This is a difficulty which has been recognized from the earliest ages of the Church and has given rise to divers systems or schools of interpretation. Of these various schools it will be sufficient for our purpose to review briefly the teachings of the four principal ones.

The Alexandrine School, of which the illustrious Origen was the most distinguished representative, favored what is known as the *allegorical, mystical* or *ideal* system of inter-



preting the Genesiac days. The Syrian School stoutly opposed the teachings of the Alexandrines, and advocated what is called the *literal* system. The most eminent exponents of this system were St. Ephrem and St. John Chrysostom and the great Cappadocian, St. Basil. The third system, adopted by Cardinal Wiseman, Buckland, Chalmers, and other distinguished scientists of their time, defends what is known as the theory of *intervals* or *restitution*. The fourth system, which is the one now generally preferred, is called the *period* or *concordistic* system. The last two systems are quite modern and do not antedate the present century. They are based on the discoveries of geology and paleontology, and are an attempt to reconcile the teachings of science with those of revelation. The period or concordistic system is due to the great Cuvier, who gave the first exposition of it in 1821.

Besides these four systems of interpretation I must direct attention to a fifth known as the *eclectic* system—championed by St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Augustine. It has had many followers, and has, probably, wielded a greater influence in exegesis, and that too for a longer time, than any other system of interpretation.

According to the Alexandrine school the Mosaic narrative of creation is to be interpreted as a simple allegory. The six days are not to be understood in a literal, but in a mystical sense. The work of creation was not distributed over a period of six days of twenty-four hours each, but all things in the material universe—the cosmos—were created instantly and simultaneously. The words of Moses are to be understood not in their natural and ordinary acceptation, but are to be interpreted in a figurative sense. And more than this. By this method of procedure the text was forced to disclose divers moral and dogmatic teachings which are entirely excluded by the literal and common meaning of the words.

The allegorical method of interpretation, which exercised such a profound influence on scriptural exegesis in the earlier ages of the Church was introduced by the rabbinical schools of Palestine long anterior to the Christian era. It,

however, found its strongest advocates in the Judæo-Alexandrine School of which Aristobulus and Philo Judæus were the chief representatives. The former lived about one hundred and fifty years B. C., whilst the latter was a contemporary of our Lord. Philo was an ardent admirer of the Greek philosophy, especially that of Plato. Of him it was said: "Either Plato philonizes, or Philo platonizes." He endeavored to reconcile the teachings of Plato with those of the Hebrew law-giver, and when he could not do so by interpreting Moses literally, he had recourse to allegory. According to him the narrative of the creation of the world and of man, as well as the account of the Garden of Eden are but figures and symbols. "When," says Philo, "Moses declares that God completed His work on the sixth day, you must not imagine that there is a question of an interval of days, but of the perfect number,<sup>1</sup> six." This is the number of perfection because it contains six unities, three dualities and two trinities. When, therefore, the words of Genesis declare that the world was created in six days, we must understand that this is nothing more than a metaphorical declaration of the perfect order that reigns in the universe. "It would be the height of simplicity to think," affirms the Jewish philosopher, "that the world was created in six days, or indeed that any time whatever was required."<sup>2</sup>

The Christian school of Alexandria followed closely the allegorism of Philo. Its exponents, like the Jewish philosopher, reduced the narrative of Moses to a beautiful allegory, and contended that God created all things visible, the heavens, the earth, and all that it contains, plants, animals, man, in an instant of time. They imagined that they thereby attributed to the Creator an action more in harmony with His power and immutability. And the accomplishment of this action which they conceived to be unique and general,

1 A perfect number is one that is equal to all its divisors or aliquot parts. The first in the order of numbers is  $6 = 1+2+3$ , the second is  $28 = 1+2+4+7+14$ .

2 Εὐηθεις παντὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξ ἡμερῶν, ἢ καθόλου χρόνω κόσμον γεγονέναι. *Sacrae Legis Allegor.*, Lib. I, p. 41., Edit. Turnebe.

is, they declared, plainly indicated in the first words of Genesis. "In the beginning God created heaven and earth."

The first representative of this school whose opinions on the cosmogony of Moses have been preserved to our time, is Saint Clement of Alexandria, who died in the early part of the third century. He expressly declares that all creatures were created simultaneously—*ὁμοῦ*—that the distinction in the Mosaic narrative of the six days does not indicate a real succession of time, but is a manner of speaking by which the inspired author accommodates himself to our intelligence, and to our habit of conceiving things. This is Philonism pure and simple.

But it is in Origen, a pupil of St. Clement, that we find the most ardent advocate of allegorism. He was unquestionably the most learned man of his time. His knowledge was truly encyclopediac in character. He was not only a master of all branches of sacred knowledge, but was profoundly versed in all the departments of profane science as well. Besides this he had a capacity for work that was simply stupendous. Living in the greatest intellectual centre of the world, "in the Babel of profane erudition," as Villemain calls Alexandria, surrounded by Gnostics and Neo-Platonists, whose intellects were as acute as their hatred of Christianity was intense, he soon perceived the necessity of making an effort to reconcile the teachings of faith with those of science and philosophy and to show that the truths of revelation were in perfect accord with the certain principles of knowledge taught by Plato and Aristotle. He wished, in the language of Mgr. Freppel,<sup>1</sup> that "the letters, arts and the sciences should form the propylaea of a temple of which philosophy should be the base and of which theology should be its summit and crown." He studied the Sacred Scriptures from every point of view, and wrote numerous and exhaustive commentaries on them. He established a school which was famous throughout the Orient and introduced a system of exegesis that left its impress on all subsequent systems.

1 *Cours d'Eloquence Sacrée, Origène, Tome I, p. 46.*

Unfortunately, a great portion of Origen's voluminous works have been lost. Enough, however, is left of his writings to enable one to know his mind regarding the Genesiac days of creation.

Like his predecessors, Philo and Clement, Origen believed in the simultaneous creation of the universe. His reason for holding this opinion was because he found it impossible to conceive of days, like the first three days of Genesis, with evenings and mornings, without sun and moon. "What man," he asks, "possessed of ordinary common sense will believe that there could have been a first, a second and a third day, an evening and a morning, without sun, or moon, or stars?"<sup>1</sup> For this reason he does not hesitate to declare that the word "days" is to be interpreted figuratively; that it means not divisions of time or duration, but refers rather to the order or gradation of God's works. The opinion of the celebrated bishop of Alexandria, St. Athanasius, respecting simultaneous creation was essentially the same as that of Origen. "No creature is older than another. All species were created at the same time by a single fiat of the Divine will."<sup>2</sup>

But Origen's teaching regarding the days of Creation is negative rather than positive. He does not so much formulate a theory concerning the nature of these days as he demonstrates the inadequacy of six days to explain the facts detailed in the narrative of the inspired writer. His opinion regarding the simultaneity of Creation is rather a provisional conjecture than a clearly conceived hypothesis, to be advocated to the exclusion of every other explanation. A careful examination of his works discloses this fact, and evinces beyond cavil that it was not *succession* in the divine works that he objected to, nor the *idea of time*, as implied in the cosmogic days. Neither did he combat the idea of *days*

1 Τίς γοῦν νοῦν ἔχων οἰήσεται πρώτην καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν, ἐσπέραν τε καὶ πρωΐαν χωρὶς ἡλίου γεγονέναι, καὶ σελήνης καὶ ἄστρον. Περὶ ἀρχῶν. Lib. iv, 16.

2 Τῶν κτισμάτων οὐδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ ἑτέρου προγένεον, ἀλλ' ἀθρόως ἅμα πάντα, τὰ γένη ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ προστάγματι ὑπέστη. Orat. ii. Contra Arian. n. 60.

understood in a vague sense, as synonymous for indefinite periods of time. It was the theory that the Mosaic days were days of twenty-four hours each that he repudiated, and which he found impossible to reconcile with either the facts of nature or the words of the Sacred Text. We may, therefore, say of Origen what the Abbé Motais affirms of the school of which the erudite Alexandrine was the most illustrious representative:—"It is then undeniable that the School of Alexandria taught in reality but one thing: the inadequateness of days of twenty-four hours for the interpretation of Moses."<sup>1</sup>

The Alexandrine theory, as we now know, is contrary to the teaching of science. "Geology establishes the fact that the creation, or at least the ordering of the world, was not simultaneous, but gradual and progressive. The earth did not at once appear, as we behold it to-day, divided into seas and continents, adorned with its garment of verdure and animated by the presence of man and a multitude of animals of every species. Life was manifested only by degrees as in the creation described by Moses, with whom geologists are in essential accord.

"The error of the Alexandrines proceeded from the defects of the science of the time. Philo attempted to reconcile Hellenism with the teachings of Moses. Clement and Origen endeavored to apply the philosophical spirit to the data of a Christian revelation, and to demonstrate that Plato and his pagan compeers were one in their doctrines, and that, furthermore, in so far as they were true, they were one with the Bible. They essayed, therefore, to fathom the dogmas of revelation, and cause them to be respected by reason, by corroborating them by the authority of the most venerable sages of antiquity, and by making all human sciences ancillary to theology. The end was grand and noble, but the undertaking was difficult, and even the genius of Origen bent under the load. The masters of the Christian

<sup>1</sup> *Origine du Monde d'après la Tradition*, Ouvrage Posthume du Chanoine Al. Motais, de l'Oratoire de Rennes. p. 127.

school falsely imagined that there were passages in Scripture which it was impossible to defend by taking them literally, and, hence, in order to explain them, they, after the example of Philo, had recourse to allegory.”<sup>1</sup>

They fancied, among other things, that it was impossible to accept as literally true the biblical narrative of Creation. How could one, for instance, believe that God was obliged to interrupt His work six different times before completing it? How reconcile this with His almighty power? The naturalists of that period never suspected that our globe had assumed its actual form only after a long series of revolutions. Ignorant of the truth and persuaded that the literal sense of the biblical narrative was irreconcilable with the philosophy of their epoch, Clement and Origen concluded that the first chapter of Moses was but an allegory, and they interpreted it accordingly. Such is the explanation of their exegetical system. But suppose their environment to have been different; suppose them to be living in our day. We may be certain that the Clements and the Origenes would hail with gladness the discoveries of geology, because they would not be obliged to change any of their fundamental principles, regarding the accordance of science and faith. All that would be necessary would be to give these principles a different application.<sup>2</sup>

The allegorism of the Alexandrine school—an allegorism that was frequently of the most extravagant character—was not long in provoking opposition. A reaction was inevitable, and it came from the schools of Edessa, Antioch and Cæsarea, the most distinguished exponents of which were respectively St. Ephrem, St. John Chrysostom, and St. Basil.

St. Ephrem, who wrote in Syriac, and whose writings exercised for many centuries a profound influence on the thought of Western Asia, rejects in the most positive manner the Alexandrine teaching respecting simultaneous creation.

<sup>1</sup> *La Cosmogonie Mosaique*, par l'Abbé Vigouroux, pp. 35-36.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

“In the beginning,” he declares, “God created the substance of heaven and earth, that is of a heaven and an earth truly existing in nature. Let no one, therefore, presume to look for allegories in the work of the six days. It is not permitted to affirm that those things were created instantly which the Scripture informs us appeared successively and on separate and distinct days. It is equally forbidden to imagine that the words of Scripture are names which do not designate things, or which designate things other than those that the words themselves signify. In the same manner, then, in which we understand by the heaven and earth which were at first created, a true heaven, and a true earth, and do not suppose that the two terms signify something else, so likewise should we be on our guard against holding to be without meaning the terms which express the arrangement of other substances, and the sequence of divers works, and should boldly confess that the nature of these divers beings is very accurately represented by the different terms by which they are denominated.”<sup>1</sup> According to him the days of Genesis are ordinary days of twenty-four hours each.

But a very remarkable fact in St. Ephrem’s view of creation is that he maintains that the first verse of Genesis teaches the creation *ex nihilo* of elementary matter, from which all the bodies of the material universe, earth, sun, moon, stars, were subsequently formed. We shall see in the sequel how this idea was at a later period developed by St. Gregory of Nyssa, and how it forestalled the general conception of Kant and Laplace.

St. John Chrysostom, like the illustrious deacon of Edessa, formally repudiates the teaching of Origen and his school regarding simultaneous creation. God could, indeed, he is willing to concede, have created the universe in the twinkling of an eye, but He did not choose to do so. On the contrary, He deigned to conform, in a measure, with our way of acting, in order that we might the more readily comprehend His work. He wished, moreover, to teach us that this

<sup>1</sup> Quo’ed by Motais, Op. cit., p. 131 et seq.

world is not the result of chance but the work of an all-wise Providence who "ordained all things in measure and number and weight."

Severien, bishop of Gabales in Syria, a contemporary of St. John Chrysostom, expresses with even greater precision than the golden-mouthed orator his views regarding the Hexaëmeron. At the same time he distinctly enunciates the opinion of St. Ephrem respecting the creation from nothing of the primitive matter from which all things visible were afterwards fashioned. "God," he tells us, "made all things in the space of six days. The first day, however, differs from those which followed. On the first day God produced from nothing—ἐξ μὴ ὄντων—and, starting from the second day, He did not create from nothing, but transformed according to His pleasure that which He created the first day. . . . God then," he concludes, "created primal matter—ὕλην τῶν κτισμάτων—on the first day, and during the subsequent days He did no more than give form and beauty to what He had already called from nothing."<sup>1</sup>

What St. Ephrem taught at Edessa and Nisibus—because he was alternately the head of both these schools—and what St. John Chrysostom maintained at Antioch, St. Basil defended at Caesarea. The master of the schools of Edessa and Nisibus had laid down the canons of literalism, and the chief representatives of the schools of Antioch and Caesarea accepted them with but slight modifications. The basis of St. Ephrem's system of interpretation may be summed up in two propositions. First, that the things named by Moses have a real existence, and secondly, that the Genesiac days are ordinary days of twenty-four hours.

To these canons of St. Ephrem, St. Basil cordially subscribes. Nay more; in his defense of literalism he is disposed to go even further than had any of his predecessors. Origen had pushed allegorism to its extreme limit. He saw a hidden meaning in the simplest declarations of Scripture. According to his method of interpretation what he called

1 Τὴν μὲρψωσιν καὶ τὴν διακόσμησιν τῶν κτισμάτων.—Orat. I, n. 3. De Mundi Creat.



the spiritual or mystical senses came first; the literal sense—he named it the “corporeal sense”—was in most cases but secondary. But if Origen erred by carrying allegorism too far, St. Basil, in his efforts to counteract the tendency of the illustrious Alexandrine’s teachings, fell into an analogous error by laying too much stress on the literal method. In his zeal to conserve the true meaning of the words of the Sacred Text, he rejected allegory entirely, and thus often confounded the proper sense, in which the words are to be taken *ut sonant*, with their figurative sense, which, in the mind of the author, gives their true literal meaning. In his ninth homily on the Hexaëmeron, he enunciates distinctly the principles of exegesis by which he is guided. “I know,” he tells us, “the laws of allegory, although I am not their author, but have found them in the works of others. Those who do not follow the common interpretation of the Scriptures do not call ‘water,’ water. They see in this word something entirely different. And in like manner they give a fantastical meaning to the words ‘plants’ and ‘fishes.’ And yet more. The generation of reptiles and other creatures become, according to their arbitrary teaching a subject of allegory. In this they resemble those who give to the objects of their dreams a signification which is in accordance with their taste or desires. As for myself, I call ‘a plant,’ a plant, and I interpret the words ‘plant,’ ‘fish,’ ‘wild animals,’ and ‘flocks,’ as I find them in the Scripture.” He gives to these words their proper, literal meaning because Moses employs the words ordinarily used for designating these objects. In a similar manner, because the inspired writer employs the word “day” in his narrative, he insists on attributing to it the primary signification of a period of twenty-four hours. In a word, he concludes, though falsely and illogically, that because some of the words are to be understood in their plain, obvious sense, they are all to be so interpreted. What he found reprehensible in Origen—the application of a figurative sense to a whole narrative because some of the words of this narrative were figurative—is precisely similar to what we find fault with in his too close adherence to literalism.

Because some of the words of the Genesiac narrative are undoubtedly to be taken in their proper and simple signification, he infers that all are to be thus understood—that all figures are to be rejected even when the words of the context plainly indicate, as in some of the passages of the first chapter of Genesis, that the figurative sense of the words is in reality the only one which can truly give the literal sense of their author.

The Syrian schools, therefore, as distinguished from that of Alexandria, contend that the true sense of Holy Writ is to be found by a strict interpretation of the letter of the text, without, however, excluding entirely all allegory. But with them, as we have seen, the figurative sense is always secondary. They escaped, indeed, the reefs encountered by Origen and his followers, but they ran foul of other obstacles equally perilous. In their anxiety to preserve intact the word of God, they fell into numerous errors in matters of science from which the Alexandrine school escaped. But we need not go far to seek the reason for such lapses into error. The natural and physical sciences did not receive the attention in Syria that was given them in Egypt's brilliant capital. The doctors of Edessa and Nisibus and Antioch, did not have to meet the objections proposed to the masters of the Christian School of Alexandria by the keenest exponents of Neoplatonism and Gnosticism. They had not to ward off shafts of sarcasm and ridicule like those which were so persistently directed against Origen by that precursor and prototype of Voltaire—Celsus—one of the bitterest and keenest opponents of the Christian name. And it was because they were thus free from the attacks of anti-Christian philosophy, that they were guilty of blunders in science which they would not otherwise have committed. Liberalism, no doubt, rendered good service to the cause of exegesis, but its too exclusive adoption was the source of many errors that were prejudicial to the cause of both Scripture and science.

A couple of instances in point will make my meaning more clear.

St. John Chrysostom, interpreting literally the words of the

Psalmist: "Who established the earth above the waters," maintains that the earth actually reposes on the waters. He fails to distinguish the metaphorical from the proper sense of the words, and mistakes a figurative statement for a positive declaration of science.

Again, by a forced interpretation of the words of Isaias: "He that stretcheth out the heavens as nothing, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in," the Egyptian monk, Cosmas Indicopleustes, imagined that the universe had the form of a tent, or of the tabernacle built by Moses in the wilderness, and that the earth is a rectangular plane twice as long as it is broad and enveloped on all sides by the heavens, or firmament.

No better example could be cited of the danger of insisting on a too literal interpretation of Scripture, especially in matters that evidently come within the purview of science. If allegorism is fraught with danger when pushed too far, literalism is equally so when accepted as the chief, if not sole norm of biblical interpretation.

JOHN A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

*University of Notre Dame, Indiana.*

---

#### ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA AND THE NEBULAR HYPOTHESIS.

As a consequence of the failure of literalism and allegorism to satisfy the demands of critics, and explain numerous difficulties in the Mosaic account of creation—not to speak of other parts of the Bible—it soon became apparent that some other system of interpretation was required, that would not be open to the defects inherent in the systems of Alexandria and Syria. A compromise was needed—a sort of *via media*, which would evade what was objectionable in the older schools, while it retained all that was good and consonant with the requirements of science and biblical criticism.

The first one to broach this compromise, and to pave the way for a *via media* was the illustrious brother of St. Basil,

St. Gregory of Nyssa. St. Basil, by the very brilliance and ardor of his defence of the literal school, had precipitated a reaction which was as inevitable as was that which followed the allegorism of Origen. For Caesarea, where the great bishop gave his exposition of the *Hexaëmeron*, like Alexandria, was, as St. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, "a metropolis of arts and sciences." In Caesarea, as in Alexandria, the Bible and the dogmas of Christianity were the objects of the constant attacks of pagan philosophy and Manichæan dualism. But no question, probably, excited greater interest, or provoked more discussion than that respecting the origin of the world. To the *Genesis* account of the unity of origin of all things, the Manichæans opposed their system of dualism, while Julian, the apostate, labored with demoniac zeal and persistency to prove that the cosmogony of Plato was superior to that of Moses. All the resources of Greek science were marshaled against the Christian citadel; every species of stratagem was resorted to, and every form of assault tried, but in vain. The Christian defenses remain impregnable, and the soldiers of the Crucified came forth from the conflict not only unscathed, but stronger than they had ever been before, and better prepared to fight new battles and achieve other and more glorious triumphs.

A characteristic of the great Cappadocian doctors, that we must not lose sight of, was their great love of science. They were eminent not only for their vast knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures, but also for their accurate acquaintance with all the branches of profane science as taught in the best schools of their time. Indeed, in the *Hexaëmeron* of St. Basil, we have, according to the Abbé Bayle, a resume of all that was known in the illustrious prelate's day respecting astronomy, physics and natural history. While studying at Athens, he devoted special attention to profane science, and made a critical examination of the divers systems of cosmogony as taught by the various schools of Greek philosophy. According to all accounts he was one of the most learned men of his century, and if we detect errors of science in his exegesis,

we must attribute them to the defective knowledge of his age—when all the inductive sciences were still in an inchoate state—rather than to an ignorance on his part of any of the positive knowledge possessed by his contemporaries. For we must not forget that in the time of the great Bishop of Caesarea *a priori* reasoning, rather than observation and experiment, was appealed to to explain the origin and nature of the visible universe. Theory and speculation, as a consequence, often took the place of real science, and errors innumerable were the inevitable result.

Such being the case, far from finding fault with the mistakes in science which we observe in the works of the early Christian exegetists, we should rather be surprised that the errors are so few. They were certainly not more numerous, nor more serious, than those found in the works of the ablest of the professional exponents of the profane science of the period. It were foolish to expect them to know more about geography than Eratosthenes, and Strabo and Pomponius Mela, who had made a life-study of the subject; or to demand of them a more accurate knowledge of astronomy than was possessed by Hipparchus, or Ptolemy; or to suppose that they should have a more precise and a more extended acquaintance with physics and natural history than had Aristotle or Pliny. Such an exaction would be the height of unreason. As well might we find fault with them for not being so well versed in physics as Ampère or Maxwell, or reproach them for knowing less of astronomy than Leverrier or Father Secchi, and less of geography than Humboldt, Malte-Brun, or Carl Ritter—men whose science was based on the experiments and observations of thousands of investigators, and on the accumulated knowledge of well nigh twenty centuries.

But we may go yet further. Not only were the exegetists I have named, especially those of Alexandria and Caesarea, imbued with a love of science, and fully abreast with every advance of scientific research, but they were the first to propose or develop a true theory of the origin of the world and to lay the foundations of cosmogonic doctrines that are usually credited

to investigators of a much later epoch. A most striking illustration of the truth of this statement is found in that marvel of exegesis—the *Hexaëmeron* of St. Gregory of Nyssa—wherein is developed, in unequivocal terms, the same hypothesis that has so long been regarded as the special glory of the *Système du Monde* of Laplace.

St. Gregory of Nyssa, who was the youngest brother of St. Basil, was induced to write his great work by an elder brother, Peter, the Bishop of Sebaste, who became alarmed at the criticisms that were constantly made on the cosmogonic views of the eloquent Bishop of Caesarea. Gregory was inferior to Basil in eloquence and erudition, but surpassed him in scientific method and philosophic spirit. His prime, if not his sole intention, when he took up his pen and engaged in the controversy, was to defend his brother from the attacks of his critics. But he soon found himself almost unconsciously and against his own will, forced to abandon this idea. He discovered that the cosmogonical views of Basil could no longer withstand the onslaughts of the critical Greeks, who had carefully followed them from beginning to end.

But he would never admit that there was any fundamental difference between his teaching, and that of his distinguished brother. He maintained that Basil, speaking in a large church, to a numerous audience, was obliged to adapt his language to the intelligence of his hearers, but that in spite of his precautions he was often misunderstood. Gregory's purpose, then, was to explain the views of his brother, and not to contradict them or to proclaim them untenable. But although he disavows any intention of advocating aught that was different from what his brother had taught, and although he explicitly declares that his sole purpose is to graft a small shoot on the noble tree of his master, he does, as a matter of fact, teach doctrines essentially different, and promulgates a theory of cosmogony, that not only makes him the founder of a new school of exegesis, but which evinces that he was one of the clearest and boldest thinkers that the world has ever known.

St. Gregory of Nyssa, like his brother St. Basil, and his illustrious friend, St. Gregory Nazianzen, accepted the Alexandrine doctrine of simultaneous creation. But he succeeded better than either his brother or his friend in keeping to the *via media* between the Alexandrines on the one hand and the Syrians on the other. He avoids the excessive allegorism of the former as well as the exaggerated literalism of the latter. Like Origen and Athanasius he admits the name and idea of simultaneous creation, but rejects the purely symbolic explanation of the first chapter of Genesis which was given such vogue by Philo. With the Syrians he distinguishes six real days in the work of creation, but unlike them, he is not a slave to the letter of the Sacred Text. His method is more critical, and he acknowledges on all occasions the service that profane science may render to Scriptural exegesis.<sup>1</sup>

According to St. Gregory of Nyssa, the words "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," do not refer to the creation of the heavens and the earth, as we now behold them, and still less do they signify the creation of the creatures—plants, animals and man—that inhabit the earth. They refer rather to the creation from nothing of the primitive, cosmic matter—from which all forms of matter, organic and inorganic, were subsequently fashioned. In modern phraseology, all the material universe was at first in a gaseous or nebulous condition, and from this nebulous matter all the heavenly bodies, sun, moon, stars, planets were in course of time evolved. The Saint finds a warrant for this interpretation in the words of Genesis itself. For, according to the inspired writer, the earth after the first creative act, was "void and empty," or as the Septuagint has it, "invisible and discomposed."<sup>2</sup>

1 Cf. F. Vigouroux, *op. cit.* p. 88.

2 The words of the Vulgate are *inanis et vacua*. The Septuagint, however, employs terms that are more expressive, and which are at the same time in perfect accord with the teaching of modern science regarding the origin of the world. The words used by The Seventy are *ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύητος*—*invisibilis et incomposita*—and indicate a condition of things

In the beginning, then, all things were created potentially rather than in act; they were contained naturally or in germ in the invisible and unformed matter that came forth from nothing in response to the divine *fiat*. The first sentence of Genesis tells us of creation properly so called—the *opus creationis*. That which follows refers to the formation, from pre-existing matter, of all the bodies of the universe. This is what theologians call the *opus formationis*, and what modern scientists denominate development of evolution.

In the beginning, therefore, according to St. Gregory of Nyssa, all was in a chaotic or nebulous state. But it did not remain so, because the Almighty put it under the action of certain physical laws by virtue of which it was to go through that long cycle of changes of which science speaks, and about the existence of which there can, it seems, no longer be any reasonable doubt.

The manner in which the Saint expresses himself when treating of this subject, is, considering the scientific knowledge of his time, simply marvelous. He seems to have had an intuitive knowledge of what could not then be demonstrated, and of what could be known only after the revelations of modern geology and astronomy. In this respect he often reminds one of Aristotle who had intuitions of certain of the laws and processes of nature, of which there was no experimental evidence until more than two thousand years after he had given expression to his opinions.

After the primitive, nebulous matter of the cosmos was created, certain molecules, St. Gregory teaches, began, under the influence of attraction, to unite with other molecules, and to form separate masses of matter. In the course of time, these masses of matter, rotating on their axes, gave off similar masses, which assumed a spherical form. In this wise were produced the sun and moon, stars and planets.

The various heavenly bodies resulting from the condensation of the primitive nebulæ, that filled all space, exhibited,

implied by the word *chaos* of the Greek philosophers, the "*rudis indigestaque moles*" of the Roman poet, and by the Hebrew words *תהו ובהו*, which are often rendered by the words *solitudo et inanitas*.



as St. Gregory declares, many and striking differences. They differed in size, weight, luminosity : in their relative distances from their centres of attraction and in the orbits which they described with such unerring precision and harmony.

But in this brilliant conception, in which he could but divine what Laplace and his compeers have made all but certain, St. Gregory recognized the existence of laws which he was unable to detect, much less comprehend. These were the laws made known long ages afterwards by the investigations of Kepler, Newton and Plateau, and the laws of chemical affinity which have thrown such a flood of light on the secret operation of nature. But in spite of its many defects, due to the ignorance of the age in which he lived, his *Hexæmeron* will ever remain a noble specimen of learning and philosophical acumen, and his theory of the formation of the world must always be regarded as a marvel of scientific divination that is unsurpassed by even the boldest conceptions of that master-intellect of the world—Aristotle. No exegetist has ever been more happy in the employment of the scientific method ; no one has ever had a keener appreciation of the reign of law and order which obtains in the universe ; no one has ever realized more thoroughly that the cosmos, as we now see it, far from being the work of chance or the result of a series of divine interventions, is the outcome of a gradual evolution of that primordial matter which God created in the beginning ; which He then put under what we call the laws of nature, and which He still conserves by His Providence. Excepting unimportant details the general tenor of his cosmogony is to-day as consonant with the teachings of Scripture and the latest conclusions of science as is that of an interpreter of our own century. He is conscious of the difficulty of making the days of Genesis days of twenty-four hours, as did his brother and the exponents of the literal school generally, but out of respect for those whom he held in such great reverence, he appears to have been unwilling to grapple with the difficulty directly, much less to propound a theory that could be construed as a contradiction of the doctrine of St. Basil, whom he had it in

purpose to explain and defend. But notwithstanding his deep reverence for his brother and the delicacy of feeling he exhibits towards him throughout his masterly work on Genesis, one cannot but recognize that he considered the teachings of the literal school inadequate to explain the declarations of Moses, and that a new interpretation—the one he himself so modestly suggests—is the only one which can afford a logical answer to the difficulties raised, and which at the same time harmonizes with both the words of the Sacred Text, and with the teachings of profane science. His teaching regarding the evolution of the universe under the action of physical laws, and the gradual formation of the earth, and the successive production and development of the various creatures which inhabit it, leaves us in no doubt as to his theory of cosmogony, nor as to the fact that he is in all justice to be regarded as the father and founder of the modern school of Scriptural interpretation, as well as the real originator of the nebular hypothesis<sup>1</sup> that is so exclusively attributed to modern thinkers, especially Kant, Herschel and Laplace.

JOHN A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

*University of Notre Dame, Indiana.*

---

## ST. AUGUSTINE AND EVOLUTION.

### EXEGESIS—OLD AND NEW.

But wonderful as were the scientific intuitions of St. Gregory of Nyssa, they were eclipsed by those of the illustrious Latin Doctor, St. Augustine. Both men were remarkable for the keenness of their perceptions, and for the logical manner in which they treated every question that was presented them for discussion. Both had a complete acquaintance with the profane sciences as taught in their day and recognized the assistance a knowledge of science may render the student of Scripture. Both, too, excelled in

<sup>1</sup> The materialistic cosmologists of the Ionic Schools, especially Thales, Anaxamander and Anaximenes, who are sometimes credited with originating the nebular hypothesis, had but a vague perception of its truth.

the scientific and philosophic method which they employed with singular success in the elucidation of controverted Biblical topics and possessed a critical faculty which was far superior to that observable in any of their contemporaries. But distinguished as he was among the exegetists of his day, and notwithstanding the fact that he was *facile princeps* among the intellectual giants of his time and race, the Bishop of Nyssa had neither the genius nor the erudition, nor the comprehensiveness of view that we admire in the prelate of Hippo. In the great African doctor we seem to have combined the searching and potent dialectics of Plato, the profound scientific conceptions of Aristotle, the learning and versatility of Origen, the grace and eloquence of Basil and Chrysostom. Whether we regard him as philosopher, theologian or exegetist; as confuting Arians, Pelagians and Manichaeans, or as vindicating the faith of the Gospel against Paganism, or grappling with the difficult and obscure questions of Mosaic cosmogony, or fixing, with long and steadfast gaze, his eagle eye on the mystery of the Trinity, the Doctor of Grace is ever admirable, at once the glory of the Church and the Master of the ages.

In Scriptural exegesis he is the author of the system usually known as *eclecticism*, a system that was based in some measure on the teachings both of the Alexandrine and Syrian schools. Like St. Gregory of Nyssa, he saw the necessity of a *via media* between the systems advocated by Origen and Ephrem, but unlike him he was more positive in his repudiation of the insufficiency of literalism and in his condemnation of the extravagances of allegorism. He scrutinized both systems closely, and exhibited in the most luminous manner the merits and defects of each. At one time he was disposed to take refuge in the simultaneity of the Alexandrines; at another he sought light in the interpretations of their opponents at Edessa and Caesarea. He critically examined, one by one, the theories of his predecessors and found them wanting. He evolved theories of his own, until they numbered more than half a score, but without any satisfactory result. Indeed, the Mosaic Hexaëmeron seemed

to possess a special fascination for him, and the problems which it raised appeared to haunt him from the time of his conversion until the end of his life. He returns to them over and over, and takes them up repeatedly as if for the first time. He rejects methods that he had once approved, and casts aside as untenable theories which he himself had most strongly supported. At one time he appears to be a disciple of Origen and Clement, at another a pupil of Ephrem and Basil. His is the intellect of genius groping in darkness and essaying the impossible in the region of mystery. We see this whenever the question of creation is mooted—in his “Confessions” and in his “City of God;” in his unfinished work on Genesis, and in his “Retractions;” and his crowning treatise on the subject—the most complete antiquity has left us on creation—the twelve books entitled *De Genesi ad Litteram*.

During the twenty-five best years of his life the first two chapters of Genesis were continually before the Saint's mind. What did Moses mean by the words “days,” he asks again and again, in accents of mingled pathos and despair. How could there be days in the ordinary acceptation of the word before the sun was created on the fourth day? Were not the first three days mentioned by Moses periods of time rather than ordinary days of twenty-four hours each? And what about the seventh day—a day that had no evening—a day therefore, that still endures? And yet another difficulty. How explain according to the laws of nature, which are the laws of God, the production and development of the various forms of plant and animal life in the short period of six ordinary days?

The idea that God, during the Genesiac days, operated in a manner different from that which subsequently characterized His Providence, that the laws which governed the material universe were not the same then as they were afterwards; that the Hexaëmeron was distinguished by a series of miracles, and a succession of specific creations, rather than by the reign of law that the Creator Himself had imposed on matter, and by which it was endowed with the

power of gradual evolution and differentiation, seemed so repugnant to the keen and logical intellect of Augustine that he could never bring himself to adopt it, much less give it his support.

That the Almighty should interrupt His work after having commenced it; that He should take it up six several times before completing it, was to his mind as inconsistent with just ideas of divine power and wisdom as it was to that of Origen. What he knew of the uniformity of the laws of nature contradicted such an interpretation, and the more he studied the Sacred Text the less warrant there seemed to be for it in the words of the inspired writer. He does not deny the miraculous. Far from it. But he does not favor the invoking the aid of miracles without necessity, or appealing to them in every difficulty of interpretation, and thus making them serve the purpose of a *Deus ex machina*.

In his "Confessions"<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine gives us an idea of the special attraction which the Hebrew cosmogony always possessed for him. "Let me hear and understand," he prays, "how in the beginning Thou didst make the heaven and the earth. Moses wrote this; he wrote and departed—passed hence from Thee to Thee. Nor now is he before me; for if he were I would hold him, and ask him, and would adjure him by Thee that he would open unto me these things, and I would lend the ears of my body to the sounds bursting from his mouth. . . . As then I cannot inquire of him, I beseech Thee—Thee, O Truth, full of whom he spoke truth—Thee, my God, I beseech, forgive my sins; and do Thou, who didst give to that Thy servant to speak these things, grant to me also to understand them."

The meaning of the word "day" was as great an enigma to him as it was to Origen and his school. His reason revolts at the idea of regarding the days of Genesis as ordinary days of twenty-four hours. He is convinced that they cannot be true "solar days;" that they are not produced by the revolution of the heavenly bodies. They must, therefore, be "entirely different from the days that compose our

weeks ;” “of a character quite extraordinary, and to us unknown.’”

“What are these days ?” he inquires in his great work *De Civitate Dei*,<sup>1</sup> “It is very difficult, if not impossible to conceive, much less to declare in words.<sup>2</sup> The days which we know have an evening when the sun sets, and a morning when the sun rises. But the first three days were without a sun, which, according to Scripture, was created only on the fourth day.”

“If,” he writes elsewhere, “in the six other days the words *evening* and *morning* characterize a succession of time analogous to that with which we are familiar in the daily alterations of evening and morning, I fail to see why the seventh day did not have an evening, and why it was not followed by another morning. I look in vain for a reason why it is not said of this day as of the others : ‘And the evening and the morning were the seventh day.’ In the hypothesis of ordinary days, it is one of the seven which constitute the week ; the repetition of which gives us months and years and centuries. It should, consequently, have had an evening and been followed by the morning of the eighth day. Then, and then only would Moses have completed his enumeration, and returned to the first day named. It is, then, more than probable that the seven days of Genesis were entirely different in their duration from those which now mark the succession of time. Nothing of which we are now cognizant can give us any information regarding the first six days of the earth’s formation. The evening and the morning, the light and darkness, called day and night, were not, then, the same as we now understand by solar days. Regarding the three days which preceded the formation of the sun this view may be accepted as certain.”<sup>3</sup>

But if the Genesiac days are not solar days, what are they ? The Saint has told us what they are not. Had he any con-

<sup>1</sup> Lib. XI, Cap. vi.

<sup>2</sup> “Qui dies cujusmodi sint, aut perdifficile nobis, aut etiam impossibile est cogitare, quanto magis dicere.”

<sup>3</sup> *De Genesi ad Litteram*, Lib. IV, cap. 18.

ception of what they were? A close study of his latest works will leave no doubt about this matter.

The word "days," according to the illustrious doctor were not to be taken in a literal, but in a figurative sense. They meant, not ordinary days, but the works of creation which were unfolded in time by a series of progressive transformations. For a similar reason the words evening and morning are to be interpreted metaphorically as meaning not dusk and dawn, but the beginning and end of the divine works.<sup>1</sup>

God, according to St. Augustine, as well as according to St. Gregory of Nyssa, first created matter in an elementary or nebulous state. From this primordial matter—created *ex nihilo*—was evolved, by the action of physical laws imposed on it by the Creator, all the various forms of terrestrial life that subsequently appeared. In this process of evolution there was succession but no division of time. The Almighty completed the work He had begun, not intermit- tently, and by a series of special creations, but through the agency of secondary causes ; by the operation of natural laws —*causales rationes*—of which He was the Author.

The seventh day, which has no evening, still endures. It means, therefore, a period of time, as do also the other six days, for they are and must be identical. The divine week, spoken of in Genesis, is consequently unlike the human week. The days in the two cases, far from being analogous, are widely dissimilar, and express ideas totally different.

The great doctor of Hippo was not, it is true, able to demonstrate the truth of his theory, but he showed that it was more reasonable and more probable than any others that had been advanced, and at the same time more conformable both with the words of the Sacred Text, and with the declarations of science. He blazed out the road to be traveled by those who came after him, and established principles which served as the basis of all future exegesis.

1 "Restat ergo ut intelligamus, in ipsa quidem mora temporis ipsas distinctiones operum sic appellatas, vesparam propter transactionem consummati operis, et mane propter inchoationem futuri operis." *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, Lib. I, cap. 14.

“Unable to enter the port himself, he avoided mistaking a moving island for the main land. If he casts anchor, it is but *en passant*, and during the night only. His stops, while his vessel is riding at anchor, are but so many halts in his voyage. For twenty-five years he sails the high seas without being able to touch land. Less fortunate than Columbus, he never reached the world which was the object of his quest. The voyage was too long for a mariner without a compass. But it prepared the way for discovery. He signalizes all the shoals, he points out the route, erects light-houses, and indicates the direction to be taken. Unable to be the author of modern exegesis, he was its precursor and prophet. Prevented from establishing it on a firm basis, he did what was probably better. In the name of Moses he demonstrated its necessity.”<sup>1</sup>

A little geology, a view of the fossiliferous strata of the earth's crust in the light of paleontology, an inkling of the theory of cosmogony as based on the discoveries of modern physics and astronomy, were all that the Saint required to place his system of interpretation on the solid foundation on which it now reposes.

He was conscious of his ignorance of certain data which he did not possess, and of which he could not divine the character. But he looked to the future to remove difficulties which to him were insuperable. And when, long centuries afterwards, geology and astronomy achieved their glorious triumphs, exegetists had nothing more to do than apply the inductions of science to the principles which the great Doctor had laid down, and lo! Moses became his own interpreter, and the Bible and Science were one.

The most remarkable feature of St. Augustine's system of exegesis—a feature that has been only incidentally alluded to in what precedes—is the special stress he lays on the operation of natural laws, and the observations he makes concerning derivative creation, or creation through the agency of secondary causes. In this respect he is unique among the

1 *Origine du Monde*, par Al. Motais, p. 220.



Fathers, and far in advance of any of his predecessors. Indeed it is only now that the world is beginning to awaken to a realization of the far-reaching character of the principles which the Saint established, and of their complete harmony with both the teachings of science and truths of revelation. This is especially the case in respect of the bearing of his doctrines on the modern theory of evolution.

It may seem strange to some of my readers to be told that St. Augustine was the father of theistic evolution, and yet, paradoxical as it may appear, the statement is substantially true. Of course, it is quite evident that he knew nothing about evolution as it is now taught. When nothing more was known of the sciences of botany, physiology, and zoology than the little that had been taught by Aristotle, Galen and Pliny; when only a few species of animals and plants had been studied, and those but imperfectly; when geology and paleontology were unknown, and when the few fossils that were occasionally met with attracted either no attention or were regarded as mere *lusus naturae* or evidences of the plastic power of the earth; when the microscope was undreamed of, and when the world of microscopic life—the world “of the infinitely little” was still hidden from the gaze of the investigator; when the telescope and the spectroscope were not available for researches regarding the origin and constitution of the physical universe, it could not be expected that even a genius like that of St. Augustine—marvelous as it was for its institutions, and for its grasp of scientific principles—would be able to take the same comprehensive view of the vast field of nature, as one may now take, fifteen hundred years later, or as the illustrious Doctor would himself take, if he were now living.

And if the Saint could have had no knowledge of evolution in the sense in which it is now understood, still less could he have been an evolutionist like unto Darwin, Romanes, or Herbert Spencer, or like Schmidt, Vogt or Ernst Haeckel. The faith he professed, the philosophy by which he was guided and the revelation which illumined an intellect naturally perspicacious and open to truth, made this impossi-

ble. In what sense, then, was he an evolutionist and how may he be considered as the precursor or father of modern evolution? Let us see.

We have already remarked that St. Augustine seems to have been the first of the Fathers to have a distinct conception of the fact that the world is under the reign of law, and that God in the government of the physical universe, acts not directly or immediately, but indirectly and through the agency of secondary causes, or what we are pleased to denominate "the laws of nature." His language on this subject is so explicit that it cannot be mistaken. In his commentaries on Genesis, in his "City of God", as well as in his other works, he is continually speaking of the laws of nature—*leges naturae*—by which created things are governed; the ordinary course of nature—*usitatum cursum ordinemque naturae*; the causal reasons of things—*causales rationes*—which God gave to the world when He created all things, and in virtue of which inorganic matter becomes capable of transformation, and organic matter acquires the power of development. He insists on it that we should explain the phenomena of the physical world in conformity with the nature of things—*naturas rerum*—and not by the constant intervention of miracles, and emphasizes the fact that the Almighty has "ordained all things in measure and number and weight."

St. Augustine, as we have seen, clearly distinguishes between creation properly so-called—*opus creationis*—and the work of formation or development—*opus formationis*. The former was direct and simultaneous, for God, the Saint declares, created *omnia simul*, while the latter, he contends, was gradual and progressive and conformable to the laws of nature which now obtain. He tells us distinctly that animals and plants were produced not as they now appear but virtually and in germ—*in semine* or *ex seminibus*—and that the Creator gave to the earth the power of evolving from itself by the operation of natural laws the various forms of animal and vegetable life.

"As there is invisibly in the seed," he affirms, "all that

which in the course of time constitutes the tree, so also are we to view the world when it was created by God—*cum simul omnia creavit*—as containing all that which was subsequently manifested, not only the heavens with the sun and moon and stars . . . . but also those things which He produced potentially and causally—*potentialiter atque causaliter*—from the waters and the earth, before they appeared as we now know them.”<sup>1</sup> Again he affirms that all things were in the beginning created in an elementary condition—*in quadam textura elementorum*—and received their development subsequently, *acceptis opportunitatibus*.

In order that he may not be misunderstood, the Saint expresses himself in manifold ways. He has an exuberance of language to make his meaning clear, and a wealth of illustration which is as beautiful as it is simple and apposite. In commenting on the words: “Let the earth bring forth the green herb,” he states explicitly that plants were created not directly but potentially—*in fieri, in causa*—that the earth produced herb and tree causally—*causaliter*—and in virtue of a power it had received from the Creator—*producendi accepisse virtutem*.<sup>2</sup>

He insists on it that Moses in the first chapter of Genesis teaches that creation was a successive *secundum intervalla temporum*—; that the works of creation were not disconnected, but that on the contrary they were continuous and dovetailed, so to speak, into one another; that there was a *permixtio dierum*; that all things, plants, trees and animals, appear, multiply and develop according to the special laws of their nature—*ut agant temporales numeros suos naturis propriis distributos*—; that their development is normal, according to laws ordained for each individual; that it was the same in the beginning as it is now; that then, as now, it was effected not within a few ordinary solar days, but during a period of time which is indeterminate—*per volumina saeculorum*.

1 *De Genesi at Litt.* Lib. V. Cap. xxiii.

2 “Causaliter ergo tunc dictum est produxisse terram herbam et lignum, id est producendi accepisse virtutem.”—Op. cit., Lib. V, Cap. v.

“In the beginning,” he declares in his great work against the Manicheans,<sup>1</sup> “God created heaven and earth. By the words heaven and earth are meant all creatures made by God. They are thus denominated by the name of visible things in order that weak human minds may more readily comprehend them. Matter then as just created was invisible and formless and in the condition which the Greeks designated by the word chaos. From this individual beings—those having form—were produced.”

This formless matter, which God created from nothing, was first called heaven and earth, and it is written that: “In the beginning God created heaven and earth,” not because it was forthwith heaven and earth, but because it was destined to become heaven and earth.<sup>2</sup> When we consider the seed of a tree we say that it contains the roots, the trunk, the branches, the fruits and the leaves, not because they are already there but because they shall be produced from it. It is in this sense that it is declared that: “In the beginning God created heaven and earth, that is to say, the seed of the heaven and the earth, when the matter of the heaven and the earth was yet in a confused state. Because heaven and earth was to be produced from this matter, it is thus called by anticipation, as it were, heaven and earth.”<sup>3</sup> Verily, in reading these words we can fancy that we are perusing some modern scientific treatise on cosmogony instead of an exposition of Genesis written by a Father of the Church fifteen centuries ago.

The theory of creation, therefore, as held by the Fathers, does not, contrary to what is so often supposed in our day, “necessitate the perpetual search after manifestations of miraculous powers and perpetual catastrophes. Creation is not a miraculous interference with the laws of nature, but the very institution of those laws. Law and regularity, not arbitrary intervention, was the patristic ideal of creation. With this notion they admitted without difficulty the most surprising origin of living creatures, provided it took place

1 *De Genesi contra Manicheos*, Lib. I, Cap. 5.

2 “Non quia jam hoc erat, sed quia jam hoc esse poterat.”

3 Loc cit., Lib. I, Cap. vii.

by *law*. They held that when God said: 'Let the waters produce, let the earth produce,' He conferred forces on the elements of earth and water which enabled them naturally to produce the various species of organic beings. This power, they thought, remains attached to the elements throughout all time."

St. Thomas Aquinas brings out this idea clearly when, in quoting St. Augustine, he declares that: "In the institution of nature we do not look for miracles, but for the laws of nature."<sup>1</sup> The same Angel of the Schools, in comparing the literal interpretation of St. Basil with that advocated by St. Augustine, asserts that the former is more conformable to the text, but that the latter is more reasonable and better adapted to defend the Sacred Scriptures against the attacks of unbelievers.<sup>2</sup>

From the foregoing it will be seen how ill-founded is the charge that Catholic exegesis is continually changing in order to make way for the new. So far is this from being the case, that it in many cases rejects the new and holds on to the old. This is particularly true of the theories of St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Augustine regarding the origin of the world, and it were easy to show that it is equally true of other views which they maintained. In details, in matters of minor importance, no one denies, or can deny, that there have been changes, or that Catholic exegetists have modified their expositions of the Scriptures so as to make them harmonize with the latest results of scientific research.

But changes in matters of detail in biblical interpretation, changes in points of view regarding Mosaic cosmogony, are quite different from changes of principles in questions of exegesis. The principles that have guided theologians and commentators have ever remained the same, however great may have been the mutations of profane science, and how-

1 "In prima autem institutione naturae non quaeritur miraculum, sed quid natura rerum habeat, ut Augustinus dicit. Lib. II, Sup. Gen. ad. Litt., Cap. i." Sum. Iae, lxxvii, 4, ad 3.

2 *Ibid.*

ever much scientific investigation may have caused us to revise our views of nature.

Catholic exegetists have always regarded the Bible as the word of God, but one of the principles of interpretation which they never lose sight of, and which it is important for us to bear in mind here, is that we must submit certain questions of Scripture to the examination of both reason and science. This is especially true of topics like the cosmogony of Moses, which refers to many things that come within the purview of science, and which science alone can explain.

Origen attached so much importance to a knowledge of profane science that, as St. Gregory Thaumaturgus relates, he taught his students physics and astronomy before he introduced them to the study of Sacred Scripture. St. Augustine is no less positive in affirming the necessity on the part of the commentator of making his interpretation accord with the dictates of reason and the certain data of science—*certissima ratione vel experientia*. He asserts expressly that the human sciences raise the mind to divine things—*disciplinæ liberales afferent intellectum ad divina*; that philosophy, which is the chief among the sciences—*omnium disciplinarum excogitatrix*—is of special service in begetting, defending, nourishing and strengthening the faith: *Fides, quæ per scientiam gignitur, nutritur, defenditur, corroboratur*.

One of the reasons that moved the Alexandrine school to adopt the theory of simultaneous creation was, as we have seen, that it harmonized better than any other theory with the philosophical systems then in vogue. And the reason why, at various subsequent epochs, divers other views were held, was because such views were considered to be more in consonance with the deductions of science and the declarations of the Sacred Text.

The theories, then, of exegetists have changed because science—or what was called science—has changed, and not because there has been any change in, much less repudiation of, the principles of Scriptural interpretation. The principles of exegesis that Origen taught, that Basil followed, that

Augustine proclaimed, were ever the same, and one with the principles that Catholic theologians now employ.

Cardinal Franzelin, in his learned tractate on Sacred Scripture, expressly declares that: "The interpretation of questions of Scripture which treat of natural things may be materially aided by the natural sciences."<sup>1</sup> This view of the erudite Cardinal, to which Leo XIII gives renewed and emphatic expression in his late Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, is the one universally held by contemporay theologians, and it was the one, and the only one, which found acceptance with the Fathers and Doctors of the early Church. No, I repeat it, the principles of exegesis have not changed, but science has progressed, and theories that were once considered as so much veritable science have been discarded for others which for the nonce are looked upon as being more tenable.

If scientists themselves modify their views to suit the latest advance of science, can they, with any show of reason, find fault with theologians and exegetists for doing the same? Surely not. The Fathers and Doctors of the Church were fully abreast with the science of their time, and it were folly to expect more than this of them; to exact of them a knowledge which those who made the pursuit of science a specialty did not possess, or to imagine that they should be as far advanced in the inductive sciences as those who have had the benefit of long centuries of observation and experiment.<sup>2</sup>

So far I have directed attention to the interpretation by the Fathers, of the Genesiac word "day;" to the theory of St. Gregory of Nyssa regarding the primitive matter from which the universe was formed, and the still more remarkable theory of St. Augustine concerning organic evolution. It would not be a difficult matter to point out other points of resemblance—some of them almost equally striking—between the views of the early Fathers in matters of science and the

1 Interpretatio in locis Scripturae quae agunt de rebus naturalibus, multum juvari potest per scientias naturales. Tractatus de Trad. et Script., p. 731.

2 See also, in this connection, the statement of Leo XIII in the above mentioned encyclical.

current teachings of some of the most competent exponents of contemporary thought.

Thus St. Gregory of Nyssa tells us that in nature there is transformation but no annihilation of matter. "Everything is transformed ; nothing is lost." All things move, as it were, in a circle. There are, indeed, changes innumerable, but all things, sooner or later, return to their original condition. Under the influence of the sun, clouds are formed from the sea ; the clouds produce rain, and the rain eventually returns again to the sea whence it came. So it is with the phenomena of combustion and decay, in the burning of oil, in the disintegration of the human body. There is a continuous and uninterrupted cycle of changes, chemical and physical, but no destruction of matter. How like a paragraph from a modern treatise on chemistry are these words of the Hexaëmeron of the illustrious Greek exegetist of fifteen centuries ago !

Again. How wonderfully the views of the acute Greek Doctor regarding the nature of light are corroborated by the results of modern physical research ! It has been objected to the Mosaic cosmogony that it must be false because it represents light as having been created before the sun and moon and stars. Light, according to the narrative of Genesis, was created on the first day, whereas the heavenly bodies were not called into existence until the fourth day. These statements, rationalists and superficial unbelievers have declared, are irreconcilable with the known conclusions of science, but so far is this from being the case that, paradoxical as it may appear, they are in perfect accord with the latest available knowledge regarding the nature of light. But St. Gregory of Nyssa, finds no difficulty in admitting the existence of light before the formation of the sun and other celestial luminaries. Anticipating the corpuscular theory of Newton, he imagined that light was a special kind of matter of which the luminous orbs of heaven were composed ; that the light-giving molecules which compose the sun and moon and stars were originally disseminated throughout the primordial nebulous mass, and came together in virtue of certain laws of affinity and attraction to which they were subject. His



theory was wrong, we now say, and so was Newton's wrong, although there are not wanting certain contemporary scientists who still aver that it is more tenable than any other theory yet advanced. But be that as it may, the fact remains that light, whatever its nature, could and undoubtedly did exist before the creation of the "two great lights" that Genesis speaks of as the work of the fourth day. Whether or not we accept the Huygenian hypothesis that light is due to the vibration of a medium filling all space, known as the ether, the undulations of which are capable of producing an impression on the retina, it still remains an incontestable fact, according to Laplace's beautiful theory that "the sun is born of light, rather than light of the sun." For long before the nebulous mass from which the sun was evolved, was sufficiently condensed to form the brilliant luminary which we now behold, the revolving cosmic mass, had, in virtue of its condensation and contraction, begun to emit light, and dissipate the darkness that before had enveloped the immensity of chaos. Not only this. The principle of light, whatever it be, is, as all physicists are aware, ever latent round about us, and requires only special excitants to develop it and make us conscious of its existence. It is disclosed in the lightning's flash, in the aurora borealis and aurora australis, and in various phenomena of chemical and mechanical action and phosphorescence.

If, however, we interrogate scientists regarding the nature of light, the only response which we shall receive is: "We do not know." We can but study its properties, and these lead us to believe that it is most probably a mode of motion excited in the ether by what are called luminous bodies. It is the undulatory movements of this ether which, by means of the eye, give use to the sensation of sight. But of the true nature of light we are absolutely ignorant.

"At what period in the development of the universe the emission of light began, science is unable to say. It can, however, assert that light existed long prior to the separation of matter, or the formation of distinct luminous bodies. For this reason, there can, therefore, be no question of a con-

tradition between the Genesiac narrative and the declarations of science regarding the origin of light."<sup>1</sup>

There is certainly nothing in modern science that can impair in the least the truthfulness of the Mosaic cosmogony, much less discredit the Genesiac narrative. We may to-day have truer conceptions of the nature of light than had St. Gregory and St. Augustine, but the enemies of the Bible are no more able now to show any discrepancy between the certain data of science and the words of Genesis regarding the creation of light than were the impugnors of the Inspired Record in the first ages of the Church's existence.

And so I might continue giving illustrations of the perfect harmony that exists, and must exist, between Genesis and science. But my object is not to write a treatise on the subject, but only to exhibit, in a few of the more controverted points, the fact that there is no ground whatever for the statements that are so often made regarding the hopelessly irreconcilable conflict which a certain class of scientists would have us believe exists between revelation and science; between the declarations of Moses and the legitimate conclusions of the Higher Criticism, or the indisputable inductions of geology and astronomy.

JOHN A. ZAHM, C. S. C.

*University of Notre Dame, Indiana.*

---

#### MODERN THEORIES OF COSMOGONY.

REGARDING the *Restitution* and *Period* theories, of which mention has already been made, a brief account will be sufficient.

The *Restitution*, or *Interval*, theory, as it is sometimes called, is a kind of link between the literal and period theories. Like the former it interprets the word "day" literally, but at the same time it postulates an indefinite lapse of time between the first act of creation and the six days of Genesis. In this wise it aims to harmonize the assumptions of the two theories and to blend them into one.

<sup>1</sup> Pfaff.—Schoepfungsgeschichte. p. 746.

According to the interval theory, the creation of the earth, of animals and plants, was slow and successive as is evidenced by the facts of geology. But a great cataclysm supervened which destroyed all forms of terrestrial life—whence the fossiliferous deposits of the earth's crust—and reduced everything to chaos. This, we are told, is what is signified by the words: "And the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep."

If, however, the first creation, indicated by the words: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," was slow and successive, the second creation, or restoration, following the great catastrophe, was accomplished in such a short space of time—six ordinary days—that there is left no trace of it for scientific investigation. But this system, proposed by Buckland, and favored by Chalmers, Cardinal Wiseman and other distinguished scholars, has now but few, if any defenders, as it is manifestly at variance with some of the simplest facts of geology.

"A careful study of the earth's crust, and the fossils which it contains," says a well known French writer, "proves that the cataclysms which were formerly admitted, never had any existence in fact; that between the flora and fauna of any given period and that of the period following, there was never any solution of continuity. The species of one epoch overlap those of the next epoch. Among the mollusks at present existing in our seas, and even among contemporary mammals, there are many which antedate man's apparition on earth by centuries, and even many thousands of years. For this reason it is impossible to suppose that these animals were created only a few days before the advent of man."<sup>1</sup>

According to the *period* theory, which at present has more defenders than any other, the "days" of Genesis were not ordinary days of twenty-four hours, but indeterminate periods of time. It is also known as the *concordistic* theory because its advocates contend that it exhibits a perfect accord between

1 Layaud de Lestrade, *Accord de la Science avec le Premier Chapitre de la Genèse*, pp. 30 et seq.

the teachings of science and the declarations of Genesis, in opposition to various *non-concordistic* theories which deny any possible reconciliation between geology and Moses.

The Genesisic days, concordists claim, were not ordinary solar days, but indefinite periods of time. The possibility of attaching any other meaning to the word, is, they assure us, precluded, not only by science, which utterly repudiates days of twenty-four hours, but also by the Sacred Text itself.

As all readers of the Bible are aware, there are many passages in the Old Testament, not to speak of the New, in which the Hebrew word *yôm*—day—signifies an indeterminate period of time. Indeed, one may find a striking instance in point without going outside of the Mosaic narrative of creation. In Genesis ii, 4, we read the words: "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord made the heaven and the earth." Here the word "day" obviously signifies not any ordinary day, but an indefinite period of time.

Again, as Abbé Vigouroux well observes, "Moses was obliged to employ the word *yôm*—day—to signify period, or epoch, as there is no special word in Hebrew to express this idea. This fact, generally unknown, deserves serious consideration. The repugnance that many have to admitting day.epochs arises from the fact that they make our word day absolutely identical with the word *yôm*, which is not the case. We have the word "day" distinct from the word "epoch," whereas in Hebrew there is but one expression for these two ideas. The Hebrew tongue is not so rich in its vocabulary as our own, and hence it is obliged to make a metaphorical use of the word *yôm* to express the idea that we attribute to the word epoch."<sup>1</sup>

But more than this. The Mosaic days, as the writer just quoted remarks, are metaphorical not only as to their signification, but also as to their number. The figure six in Gen-

esis is not to be taken in a rigorous and absolute sense. It does not mean that there were only six epochs in the work of creation, but simply that there were several successive periods of development. The number six was chosen in order that the divine might correspond with the human week, in which six days are given to work, and the seventh, the Sabbath, is consecrated to repose. Furthermore it must be noted that the cosmogony of Moses supplies only the chief outlines of the work of creation; the details, which are of less importance to the generality of men, are neglected.<sup>1</sup>

Again, Genesis, be it remembered, was not intended by its author to serve as a treatise on natural or physical science. Moses was neither a geologist nor an astronomer, and the scope of his narrative did not require of him either an exact or a profound knowledge of science. All attempts, therefore, to find in his account of creation an anticipation of the results of modern geologic and astronomic discovery, and to exhibit a detailed and exact correspondence between the days of Genesis and the different geological epochs are as unwarranted as they are sure to prove nugatory. We cannot, as is so often imagined, draw a line of demarcation between any one geological age and that which precedes or follows it. The fauna and flora of one period frequently overlap those of proximate periods. Throughout the whole of geologic time—from the Cambrian to the Quaternary Period—we observe a dovetailing of the various forms of life into one another and have exhibited in the most striking manner that *permixtio dierum* of which St. Augustine speaks, but of which he could have no knowledge in the sense in which, since his day, it has been disclosed by geology. Both science and Genesis tell us of a gradation from the lower to the higher forms of life and in this respect their testimony is as consonant as it is remarkable.

M. Barrande, the most eminent of modern paleontologists and one most competent to interpret the facts we are now considering, declares, in speaking of the subject, that :

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Les Livres Saints et la Critique Rationaliste*, par Abbé Vigouroux, Tome III, p. 262.



any other theory, and has, no doubt, much to recommend it. But even it does not explain numerous difficulties that still puzzle exegetists. There are yet many problems to be solved—problems of physical and natural science, problems of philosophy, problems of higher criticism, which baffle all present efforts, and whose solution we must leave to the future. Judging from what has already been achieved we can have no doubt about what remains to be accomplished. The result is foreshadowed by the triumphs of modern exegesis, which give a positive assurance that, in God's own time, all mysteries will be cleared up, and that both science and Genesis will eventually render the same testimony, and in language as clear as it shall be unmistakable.

Before closing our review of the most prominent theories that have obtained regarding the interpretation of the Mosaic Hexaëmeron it will be well to say a few words of the now famous theory advanced a few years ago by the late English Bishop Clifford, of Clifton. According to this theory, which is intermediate in character between the theories advocated by the schools of Alexandria and those of Edessa and Caesarea, between the allegorism of Origen, Clement and Athanasius, and the literalism of Ephrem, Chrysostom and Basil, the first chapter of Genesis is not to be construed as a historical narrative but as a ritual hymn. To quote the Bishop's own words: "The first thirty-four verses of the Bible, although they stand foremost in the collection of the writings of Moses, form no portion of the book of Genesis which immediately follows them. They constitute a composition complete in itself. They are a sacred hymn recording the consecration of each day of the week to the memory of one or other of the works done by the true God, Creator of heaven and earth, in opposition to a custom established by the Egyptian priests, of referring the days of the week to the sun, moon and planets, and of consecrating each day of the month to the memory of the actions of false deities. The hymn when examined by the light which the knowledge of the customs of Egypt, such as may at the present day be derived from the monuments and records of that country,

throws upon it, shows how carefully its detail has been arranged for the purpose of guarding against those special dangers of idolatry to which the Israelites were exposed at the time of their delivery from Egyptian bondage; thus affording an indirect but valuable confirmation of the fact that Moses was its author. This hymn not being a history of the creation, but a ritual work, the statement in it must be interpreted in the sense in which similar statements are understood when they occur in writings of a ritual character. When it is said that certain works are performed on certain days of the week, nothing more is implied than that those days are consecrated to the memory of the work referred to. Subject to this proviso the works of Moses are to be understood in their usual sense and present no special difficulty. A *day* means the space of twenty-four hours in this as in other portions of the writings of the same author. By seven days are meant the days of the week, which are simply referred to as the first, second, instead of Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and so on, because, all reference to the planets being forbidden, there remain but the numerical order by which to cite them. Words descriptive of natural objects and phenomena, such as the firmament, the deep, the waters above the firmament, and such like, mean nothing more or less than what was implied by the same words when used by the wise men of Egypt in the days of Moses. The notions of these men were wrong on many points of natural philosophy, but their error lay in the interpretation they gave to the phenomena; the phenomena themselves had a real existence. The language of Moses refers to the phenomena independently of any interpretation which may be given the same. At the present day we speak of the stars shining in the sky, the rain pouring down from the sky, the rainbow appearing in the sky, though we are all well aware that the stars are removed far above the atmosphere in which the rain gathers which reflects the rainbow. Thus understood, the words of Moses present no manner of opposition to scientific facts. In this hymn he records two things: First, that God created all things. This is a truth which no scientific fact can invali-



date. Secondly, that each of the first six days of the week is consecrated to some special work performed by God, and that the seventh is consecrated to the rest of God and must be kept holy. . . . .

As to the order in which the various parts of the creation came into existence and whether a longer or shorter period of time elapsed before our earth and its furniture assumed the appearance they now present, these are matters which form no part of Moses' task to explain. They enter not into his subject and he does not allude to them, and, therefore, whatever be the conclusions which scientific men may come to on these points they meet neither with approval nor with opposition from the words of Moses. The records of the stages of the existence of our globe form, no doubt, a subject of great interest to inquirers, but, beyond the fact that in the beginning God created heaven and earth, no revelation has been given to men concerning them. They belong exclusively to the province of science. They are a part of that *travail which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised in it. He hath made all things good in their time and hath delivered the world to their consideration.* (Eccles. iii, 10, 11).<sup>1</sup>

But it may be asked : What is the use of all this discussion where there are so many elements of uncertainty? "What," inquires St. Augustine, "is the net result of all this winnowing? Where is the good wheat that was to come of it? You raise questions without giving answers. Give us something positive, something conclusive."

The response of the Saint shall be also mine. I have done all that in the present state of science and exegesis it is possible to do. "I have shown that there is not a single declaration of science that is contrary to the teachings of Moses."<sup>2</sup> For us this is sufficient.

1 *Dublin Review*, April, 1881, pp. 330-332. See also same *Review* Oct., 1881, and Jan. and April, 1883.

2 "Dicet aliquis: Quid tu tanta tritura dissertationis hujus, quid granorum, exuisti? Quid eventilasti? Cur propemodum in quaestionibus adhuc latent omnia? Affirma aliquid eorum quae multa posse intelligi

There have, it is true, been theories innumerable, which their authors fondly imagined were subversive of the Hexaëmeron of Moses and antagonistic, consequently, to the integrity of Scripture, but there is not to-day, any more than there was in the time of St. Augustine, a single fact of science that can justly be construed as controvening the system of cosmogony contained in Genesis, or as opposed to the clear and explicit teachings of the inspired writer.

I might here conclude, but there are a few other facts, disclosed by this long discussion, which deserve at least a passing notice.

The first of these facts is the perfect intellectual freedom that the Fathers and Doctors of the Church have always claimed and enjoyed in matters outside of positive dogma. This is particularly observable in the discussion and interpretation of such questions as the one we have been considering, where science rather than revelation must be appealed to for a solution of the difficulties encountered.

We have a striking illustration of this liberty of thought in St. John Damascene, the last of the great theologians of the Oriental Church. In matters of cosmogony he chooses freely between the doctrines of the Syrian and Cappadocian schools. At one time he declares for St. Ephrem, at another for St. Basil, and at still another for St. Gregory of Nyssa. He feels that he is treading on safe ground, and that he is perfectly free to select such opinions as, according to his judgment, are most conformable to fact and truth.

And St. Gregory of Nyssa not only shows that he enjoyed perfect intellectual freedom himself, but also that he respected the opinions of others and allowed them equal liberty of thought. He does not, for instance, in the disputed questions of Mosaic cosmogony, insist on the acceptance of his own views, but modestly declares: "I think" this is so, or may be so.

disputasti. Cui respondeo, ad eum ipsum me cibum suaviter pervenisse, quo didici non haerere homini in respondendo secundum fidem, quod respondendum est hominibus qui calumniari libris nostrae salutis effectant, ut aliquid ipse de natura rerum veracitus documentis demonstrare potuerint, ostendamus nostris Litteris non esse contrarium."—*De Genesi ad Litteram*, Lib. I, cap. 21.

St. Augustine in referring to the divers interpretations which the Genesiac record admits, says: "Let each one choose according to the best of his power; only let him not rashly put forward as known that which is unknown; and let him not fail to remember that he is but a man searching, as far as may be, into the works of God."<sup>1</sup> In another place he declares that "in the obscurities of natural things our investigations should be characterized by hypotheses rather than by positive declarations—*magis proestemus diligentiam inquirendi, quam affirmandi temeritatem*," and does not hesitate to affirm that "rash and inconsiderate assertions in uncertain and doubtful passages of Scripture may easily degenerate into sacrilege." On every page of his works he inculcates both by precept and example the caution and reserve that should be exercised in the discussion of disputed questions, and is ever ready to admit in problems of cosmogony the necessarily provisional character of many of his explanations. Thus regarding one of his theories of the days of Genesis, he tells us frankly, that it is but an attempt to explain a difficult problem, and that he may sooner or later reject it for another theory. But he is the first to recognize the inadequateness of some of his hypotheses, and wishes better success to others.<sup>2</sup>

Another fact, often lost sight of, is that when the inspired writers of the Sacred Books make incidental reference to natural phenomena while teaching religious truth, they accommodate themselves to the prevailing ideas regarding such phenomena. "Many things in the Sacred Scriptures," says St. Jerome, "are expressed according to the opinion of the times in which they were written, and not according to the truth."<sup>3</sup>

1 *De Genesi Liber Imperfectus*, Cap. ix, n. 80.

2 Fieri enim potest ut etiam ego aliam (sententiam) his divinae Scripturae verbis congruentiorem fortassis inveniam. Neque enim ita hanc confirmo ut aliam quae proponenda sit inveniri non posse contendam. *De Genesi ad Litt.* Lib. IV, Cap. 28.

3 "Multa in Scripturis Sanctis dicuntur juxta opinionem illius temporis, quo gesta referuntur, et non juxta quod rei veritas continebat."—Jer. xxviii, 10-11.

“The biblical writers,” says Reusch, “received supernatural enlightenment from God, but the object of this enlightenment and of the divine revelation altogether was only to impart *religious* truths, not profane knowledge; and we may, therefore, without diminishing from the respect due to the holy writers, or in any way weakening the doctrine of inspiration, safely allow that the biblical writers were not in advance of their age in the matter of profane knowledge, and consequently of natural science. The praises given by certain French savants to the genius or scientific knowledge of the Jewish law-giver because of the supposed anticipation in Genesis of modern scientific discoveries, are, therefore, not to the purpose. As regards profane knowledge, Moses was not raised above his contemporaries by divine revelation, and there is no proof whatever of his being in a position to raise himself above them by his own thought and inquiry.”<sup>1</sup>

“It might, indeed,” declares Cardinal Newman, “have pleased the Almighty to have superseded physical inquiry by revealing the truths which are its object, but He has not done so.” And yet, notwithstanding this lack of revelation in matters of science, there is and can, I repeat it, be no discrepancy between Genesis and science. For, “in Holy Scripture,” as Kurtz has well expressed it, “all future science can find a place; it has made no mistake; no new science can cry out, ‘*si tacuisses.*’ It is by this means that it shows its divine character in dealing with questions of natural science.”

“Theology itself,” Father Faber happily observes, “will be found to fit all discoveries as they come. It is only the individual theologians who may sometimes have to humor their own private ideas.”<sup>2</sup>

If, then, there is nothing, and can be nothing, in science that is antagonistic to faith, still less is there anything about it, as some have absurdly fancied, that is irreligious. On the contrary, “to a religious mind,” as the charming writer just

1 *Bibel und Natur*, English translation, p. 32.

2 *The Blessed Sacrament*, p. 331.

quoted remarks, "physical science is an intensely religious thing."

"No sight," he avers, "can be more grateful to a true theologian than to behold the giant strides of scientific discovery, and the bold methods of scientific research. He has nothing to fear for his faith, except an embarrassment arising from the very riches of its demonstration, which these discoveries are continually supplying. Nothing can be more narrow, vulgar or stupid than the idea of an antithesis between science and religion. It is true that some of the sciences, in the earlier periods of their construction, turned the heads of those who drank at their fountains, and crude theories, incompatible with the dogmas of faith, were the result. Yet these only changed, at last, to fresh and more striking proofs of the divine and unalterable truth of our holy faith. For further discovery, and a larger induction, led, in every case, to an abandonment of the irreligious theory." . . . . .

"Geology, which is the history of nature, has been regarded as a science, the cultivation of which is especially dangerous to religious habits of mind. If it be so, it is the mind that is at fault, and not the science. The whole series of controversies ending in the admission of the extreme modernness of the present surface of the globe, and the novelty of man in creation, is nothing else but a long chain of proof of the Mosaic narrative."<sup>1</sup>

But if there is, and can be, no antagonism between Genesis and science; if, on the contrary, the two, as far as understood, are found to be in perfect accord, there are difficulties yet unsolved. Darkness is still upon the deep mysteries of many problems of Mosaic cosmogony. The future, I am convinced, will do much toward dissipating this darkness. The past history and present condition of both science and exegesis warrant such a view. But the perfect exhibition of all the hidden harmonies that we know to exist between science and revelation; the complete reconciliation of the Inspired Record

and the record of the rocks ; the *fiat lux*, that shall dispel all the mists of error and the clouds of misinterpretation which now prevent our seeing things as they are, may indeed be "a consummation devoutly to be wished," but something, most likely, that shall be vouchsafed us only in that world where all is knowledge and light ; where the mysteries of creation shall be revealed in the effulgence of God's glory.

But notwithstanding the difficulties presented by the first two chapters of Genesis, the cosmogony of Moses is the only one which antiquity has left us that can claim our assent, or challenge the investigation of science. There may be passages in it which do not at present admit of a satisfactory explanation, but there is nothing involving contradiction, and still less is there aught that can be pronounced an absurdity. Compared with the other cosmogonies of the ancient world, it is absolutely peerless, and is as far above them as history is above fiction, as truth above falsehood. Science may not unravel the knotty problems which still abound, but it cannot gainsay what Moses declares. Where there is apparent discord, we are, from the very nature of the case, certain that there is perfect harmony.

It is only when we contrast the Mosaic account of creation with the cosmogonies of the more advanced nations of antiquity that we can realize how remarkable the declarations of the Hebrew law-giver really are, and how he has answered questions before which pagan philosophy stood mute and impotent.

The Aryans of early India surprise us by their achievements in literature, science and art. Since their discovery, in the last century, the Vedas and codes of laws of the ancient Hindu have been the subjects of wonder and enthusiastic comment by scholars the world over. But Hindu philosophy never arose to a true conception of the one God. The Brahmin, wherever found, meditating on the banks of the Indus, or the Jumna, or officiating in the temples of Delhi and Benares, was an idolator who entertained the most grotesque notions regarding the origin and configuration of the world.

The geogonies and cosmogonies of Assyria and Babylonia were scarcely less extravagant and absurd than were those of India. Recent discoveries have shown that the peoples of Mesopotamia had attained a degree of civilization that would not have been credited a few decades ago. The arts and sciences were cultivated with ardor, and libraries were found in all the principle cities of Mesopotamia. Her philosophers were famed for their wisdom, and the astronomers of Nineveh and Babylon could predict eclipses and determine the courses of the Heavenly bodies with a degree of precision that, considering the rude instruments at their disposal, is nothing short of marvelous. But the gods of Assyria and Babylonia were but blocks of clay and stone, variously fashioned by the hand of man, and the peoples inhabiting the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates were as far from a knowledge of the true God, the Creator of all things out of nothing, as were the philosophical Brahmins who taught and speculated beyond the Himalayas. -

What has been said of India and Mesopotamia may be iterated with even greater truth of the land of the Pharaohs. To Egypt even the greatest of the philosophers of Greece went in quest of knowledge, and many of the doctrines which they afterwards taught their disciples were learned from the priests in the temples of Memphis and Heliopolis.

Her ruins, scattered all along the Nile valley, from Ipsambul to Alexandria, are even now, after the lapse of thousands of years, the admiration of all who behold them. Philae, Thebes and Abydos, great in decay, are, like the pyramids of Gizeh, the best evidence of the greatness and genius of the people who could plan and execute such marvels. But the builders of Cheops and the designers and constructors of the Ramessenm and the Serapeum of Memphis and the teachers of the sages of Greece, deified the river that brought fertility to their land, and worshiped not only the animals that grazed in the valley of the Nile, but even the reptiles that crawled in its slime, and the leeks and onions which grew in its gardens.

“ Crocodilon adorat

Pars haec, illa pavet saturam serpentibus ibin.

Effigies sacri nitet aurea cercopitheci,

\* \* \* \*

Illic aeluros, hic piscem fluminis, illic

Oppida tota canem venerantur, nemo Dianam.

Porrum et cepe nefas violare et frangere morsu :

O sanctas gentes, quibus haec nascuntur in hortis

Numina !”<sup>1</sup>

Nor was Greece, immortal Greece, the home of art, eloquence, poesy ; of science, history and philosophy, exempt from the errors and vagaries which were so characteristic of the great nations of the Orient. For thousands of years her art has been the art of the world, her literature the literature of the world, her philosophy the philosophy of the world. The culture of the world, the taste of the world, the æstheticism of the world come to us from the land of Plato and Aristotle, Phidias and Sophocles, Pericles and Demosthenes. For thousands of years she has been the inspiration of scholars in every clime, and has contributed to the advancement of knowledge in every department of human research. From the Academy and the Lyceum human genius winged its loftiest flight, and while soaring aloft in the blue empyrean, surveyed the fairest domains of human thought. For thirty centuries the Greek mind has directed the meditations of the philosopher, and controlled the speculations of the man of science. Her sculptured marbles have been the despair of all subsequent artists, as the Parthenon, although in ruins, still remains a dream of unsurpassed loveliness. But the noblest productions of this great land, from the matchless poems of her sightless bard to the most exquisite carving that ever graced the Acropolis, were tinctured with false views of God, and were designed to perpetuate a system of religion and foster a form of idolatry that would forever preclude man from having just notions of the Creator of the universe, or of His relations toward His creatures. Polytheism, of the most ridiculous character, dominated in Greece, and systems of cosmogony the most fantastical contended for

<sup>1</sup> Juvenal, Sat. xv, Vers. 2 et seq.



supremacy in the greatest schools of an otherwise enlightened people.

And so it was with Rome, imperial Rome, the conqueror of the world. The architectural wonders of Athens are reproduced in the City of the Seven Hills; the golden eloquence of Cicero recalls the burning philippics of Demosthenes; in the noble epic of Virgil we recognize the sublime inspiration of the Muse of Homer. But the gods of the Pantheon are the gods of Greece, reinforced by countless accessions from the temples of all the lands in which the Roman eagle had been carried and in which Roman legions had been triumphant. Lucretius embalms in elegant verse the teachings of Epicurus; the myths of Hesiod are repeated by the author of the *Metamorphoses*, and all the errors of Greek philosophy are rehearsed in patrician villas and in the palaces of the Cæsars.

How different the doctrines of the legislator of Israel! With a few bold strokes he gives us a picture of the history of creation, and in a few simple words he tells us how *in the beginning God created heaven and earth*. There is no doubt, no vacillation in the mind of the author of *Genesis*; no obscurity in his statements regarding the creative acts of Jehovah. In a single sentence he condemns the dualism of the Eastern sage and the doctrine of the eternity of matter in the Greek sophist. At the same time he brushes aside numberless other errors in philosophy and theology, and prepares the mind for a conception of the Deity that even the greatest of the pagan philosophers never attained.

In the cosmogony of Moses we have manifested in every line the spirit of revelation. Moses answers questions that the wise men of the ancient Gentile world had essayed in vain, because he is inspired. He declares the truth because he is preserved from error by the spirit of God. Only in his history of creation does reason find a satisfactory response to the queries suggested by the very existence of the visible universe, and in *Genesis* alone have we a cosmogony that is in accord with all the certain declarations of science. Infidel sciolism may reject the Mosaic account of creation, endeavor

to offer a substitute, but all such attempts are sure to prove futile, and to issue in contradictions and absurdities. Physical science cannot tell us anything about creation; cannot tell us anything about the beginning of things. Neither can it clear up the mystery enveloping the origin of life, nor show us matter, as the great Cuvier happily expresses it, *s'organisant*. Before Moses atheistic materialism, and pantheistic idealism, so characteristic of pagan philosophy and pagan religion, go down as the pigmy before the giant, and the deification of nature is seen in all its hideousness and inconsistency.

And the declarations of Moses remain the same whatever theories we may have regarding the inspiration of Genesis, or the sources from which the history of creation was drawn. Is Genesis, as we now have it, revealed or inspired? that is, is the narrative a direct revelation in its entirety, or is it simply a human tradition, the most ancient of our race, collected and used by writers who were inspired by the Spirit of Truth? Is the inspiration verbal, or does it extend only to the subject-matter of the text? Does it include all the *obiter dicta* of the narrative, or does it embrace only objects of faith and morals and obtain, to use the words of the Council of Trent regarding the true sense of the Sacred Scriptures, only "*in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae Christianae pertinentium?*" Did Moses make use of traditions that were the common property of all the peoples of Western Asia, and was the inspiration under which he wrote limited to inerrancy only in the employment of the materials at hand, and in the elimination from them of the imperfections with which they abounded? Did he have at his disposal a primitive tradition, integral and unaltered, brought by Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees, or did he avail himself of others, it may be older traditions, or legends even, that were current among the Accadians and Sumerians, who were the precursors of the Chaldeans and Assyrians in the valleys and on the plains of Mesopotamia? And if he used human documents, were they then encumbered with the exuberant polytheism of Chaldea, and vitiated by the

clumsy anthropomorphism that was so prevalent among all the pagan nations of antiquity? Are we to understand that in such an event inspiration meant simply the action of the Holy Ghost whereby Moses was able to substitute monotheism for polytheism, and convert a narrative replete with the grossest natural notions into a compendium of moral and dogmatic verities of the most exalted spiritual character?

Such are a few of the questions asked by modern science and the higher criticism, and suggested by the Assyrio-Chaldean investigations of these latter days. As far as the contention of this paper is concerned, the answers are immaterial. Affirmative or negative, the statements of the author of the Hexaëmeron convey the same meaning and proclaim the same truths. Whatever the responses eventually given to the questions propounded, it will ever remain an incontestable fact that "the theodicy of the Chaldean tablets is as far from that of the Pentateuch as the theodicy of the Mahâbha-rata or of the Theogony of Hesiod is from that of the Gospel."

The Mosaic Hexaëmeron is, then, proof against all attacks that may be directed against it in the name of modern science, Assyriology, or the higher criticism. It alone of all the cosmogonies of the ancient world has withstood the onslaughts of flippant skeptics and blatant rationalists, because it alone has fully satisfied the demands of the intellect and the aspirations of the soul. What pagan philosophy ever failed to do, what modern science, of itself, is incompetent to achieve, the author of Genesis has realized in his simple, yet magnificent portrayal of God as *Deum unum, Deum omnipotentem, Deum Creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium*.

JOHN A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

*Notre Dame University, Indiana.*

## CONFERENCES.

## THE USE OF THE COMMUNION CARD.

*Qu.* Is there any sanction in the rubrics for the use of a card or palla instead of the ordinary Communion-cloth affixed to the railing which separates the sanctuary from the body of the church?

If it be lawfully used, is the celebrant obliged to purify it of the particles which probably gather upon it, just as he purifies the corporal? This precaution would seem necessary since small particles may frequently be noticed upon the paten used during the distribution of Holy Communion at solemn Mass.

*Resp.* The use of the so-called Communion card, in place of the pliable cloth attached to the sanctuary railing, is quite proper and in many places the better or only method that can be conveniently used to guard the reverence due to the Bl. Sacrament. The rubrics prescribe a *linen cloth* or *white cover*—"minister ante eos extendit linteum, seu velum album" (Rit. Celebr. Miss. X, 6), which expression is equally applicable to the large and small cloth of linen used. Cavalieri in his chapter *De Communione fidelium* recommends the card as preferable for some reasons.

In all cases the priest is to use every precaution to avoid the falling of particles to the ground. Hence De Herdt, vol. I, n. 273, says that the Communion-cloth attached to the railing should never be let down after distribution of the Bl. Sacrament, as is often done; for in this way particles which may have gathered upon it are thrown to the ground.

The safest means of avoiding possible irreverence or accident seems to be to have, beside the ordinary Communion-cloth of which the people take hold, a card held under the chin by the server and afterwards placed carefully and flat upon the altar or the credence-table, whereby the dropping on the ground of fragments is avoided. This conforms perfectly to the rubrical prescription, and the S. Congregation has even permitted the use of a metal plate (held above the

Communion-cloth) at low Mass, just as the paten is used at solemn Mass. (S. R. C. 20 Mart. 1875 ad IV.)

The card may afterward be purified by a stroke with it upon the corporal or, after Mass, in the sacrarium ; unless distinct particles be recognized, in which case special rules for action are laid down by the rubrics.

For those who are inclined to be over scrupulous in *looking for particles* we may subjoin the sensible remarks made upon the subject by O'Kane in his *Notes on the Rubrics*, n. 655, "the loss of minute fragments . . . that fall unobserved by any one, when there is a great number of communicants, may be looked on as an unavoidable accessory of the mystery itself: and, therefore, one should not be over anxious about the matter, *when he has taken the ordinary precautions against irreverence.*"

---

#### CATHOLIC FUNERAL SERVICE AND CREMATION OF THE DEAD.

*Qu.* Recently a woman asked one of our priests to have a funeral Mass said for her husband who had suddenly died the previous day. In the course of conversation it transpired that some time ago she and her deceased husband had made a mutual promise that in case of the death of one of them the other would have the dead body cremated in order to take the ashes back to their native land. She came to request the service of blessing the corpse in the church, and meant to have it then burnt to fulfill the promise. Before giving her a definite answer the Ordinary was consulted as to what was the proper course to pursue under the circumstances. The answer from the Chancery came that the Catholic burial service could not be held if the condition of having the body cremated afterwards were insisted on ; the authority given was a decree of the S. Congregation, which prohibits Catholics from adopting this mode of disposing of the dead body. I have the decree which answers the question "An licitum sit mandare ut sua aliorumve cadavera comburantur?" by a simple *negative*.

Would you explain the *ratio* of this prohibition and say whether there is any interpretation of it which might have permitted the celebration of a funeral Mass and customary rite for the dead, under the supposition that the body is afterwards to be cremated?

*Resp.* The Bishop gave the only answer which, under the circumstances, a consistent Catholic Superior could have given. As the subject was fully discussed by us some time ago in a paper on "Cremation," we must refer the reader for the *ratio* of the prohibition to the pages of the REVIEW (Vol. iv, p. 15).

It may be asked whether, although the Holy See disapproves of this mode of disposing of the dead, an ecclesiastical Superior is justified in inflicting a public penalty by refusing the burial service to such as violate the injunction—since the Church does not attach any censure to the violation, but only prohibits the practice.

We answer that the right of episcopal jurisdiction legitimately empowers a bishop thus to discountenance an overt act of disobedience to a rule laid down by the Holy See in matters of ecclesiastical discipline. What else could the authorities of the diocese do without laying themselves open to the imputation of having flagrantly ignored an injunction of the Holy See which enjoins them, in the decree above referred to, "ut gregem sibi concreditum totis viribus deterreant"—from what?—"destabilem abusum humana corpora cremandi." These are the words of the S. Office endorsed by the express sanction of Leo XIII, bidding the bishops to warn their people against a pagan revival which aims at destroying Christian worship. To bless such a proceeding would be to overturn every law of consistent moral conduct and to place the well-founded prohibition of the Holy See in the light of an arbitrary restriction.

But we wish to call attention to a case where the Holy See has tolerated and still tolerates the practice of cremation, and we mention it here in order to draw out the lines of contrast lest it serve as an argument to the thoughtless who are ever apt to lend the sound of their noisy acclaim to the novelties of what is labeled progress.

In the missions of the East Indies, which are at the present under the care of the Fathers of St. Francis de Sales, a custom exists among certain castes of the natives of burning their dead. Some time ago this act was performed with two

young neophytes whose parents were Christians and who, whilst they permitted the burning of their children, scrupulously abstained from every form of superstition connected otherwise with the act. The Vicar Apostolic (now Bishop) of Vizagapatam, relating the fact, asked the Holy See whether in such a case the missionary would be obliged to *protest* against the proceeding at the risk of making the pagans believe that the priests came to destroy their caste-privileges. "I have every reason to hope" writes the prelate, "that by careful instruction concerning the beauty of the Christian ceremonial, and by prudent management, we shall introduce a general conformity to the approved method of burying the dead." He further asked whether the missionaries might baptize children, although foreseeing that in case of their death the parents would have them cremated. The Prefect of the Propaganda replied: "*Cremationem approbare non debes, sed passive te habeas, collato semper baptisate, et populos instruendos cures juxta ea quae a te exponuntur.*" (Ex. Litt. S. C. de Prop. Fide, 27-Sept., 1884).

Here we have an exceptional case, and in it we may also find a reason why the Holy See does not always add a definite censure to a general injunction against a threatening abuse. Whilst with us a priest would be obliged to protest against the practice, the missionaries in the East Indies may remain passive and let cremation take place uncensured. The reason of this difference is that despite the apparent similarity of the two cases they relate to essentially different circumstances :

1. With us it is a question of *introducing a custom* contrary to religious practice and instinct ; whilst in India *the custom exists* in form of a caste privilege to which the people are strongly wedded.

2. With us to *allow* such a practice would scandalize the faithful ; in India it would scandalize the people to *forbid* it, and they would suspect the Christian missionaries of hostility to their established institutions.

3. With us a prohibition or censure is likely to be *effec-*

*tive*; in India it would have *no effect* except to rouse the populace to revolt against Christianity.

4. With us it is the avowed object of the advocates of cremation to substitute it for the ancient custom of religiously burying the dead; in India there is every endeavor and reasonable hope that with the progress of Christian teaching cremation will go out of use.

---

### THE PROPOSED MARTHA INSTITUTE.

REVEREND EDITOR:—With considerable interest I have read the article of Rev. Thomas J. Jenkins, on A Training School for Parochial Housekeepers. It is certainly a novel view on an old but important subject. Being a Religious and therefore in no need of a housekeeper, I should perhaps refrain from offering an opinion. On the other hand it must be admitted that as a disinterested looker on, I am the more qualified to present at least an independent view. After sacerdotal duties, a most important subject to engage a priest's attention in temporals is:—How to procure a well trained house maid. Many a priest has had his trouble in this matter, and it is safe to say that those who have had trouble, will hail with joy the prospect of an institution to which they can apply for a reliable house servant. Undoubtedly there are many among the clergy who would not and could not have persons from such an institution as their servants, for the simple reason that they have relatives, mother or sister, to supply the needs of domestic help. For the majority of priests, however, certainly for a great number, the founding of an institution outlined by Rev. T. J. Jenkins, would be a real benefit. As a rule priests do not want to train their housekeepers, so-called. But what they do want and usually inquire for, is a reliable person who knows how to cook, understands how to keep household affairs in proper order, and is willing to take the entire responsibility of the parochial home upon her, for a just return of wages. The only reserve which a priest would be apt to insist on, is a warrant that the housekeeper will not meddle with the affairs of the congregation or the personal and private business of the clergy in the house.



It is often difficult to find such a person. There is at present a common complaint among *all classes* of society employing servants, that the number of good, reliable domestics is constantly decreasing. This state of things naturally affects clerical householders as well. Hence the novel project placed before the Public in the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, is opportune and deserves the attention of those who might further it. The founding of such an institution would create a new avocation in religion, and open up a fresh field of permanent labor to many, whilst at the same time it would supply a seriously felt want, though heretofore not so openly expressed. But an institution of the kind would certainly have to be under ecclesiastical control, and governed by laws and statutes approved of by competent authorities.

It seems to me that the author of "A Training School for Parochial Housekeepers," bases his project on rather too narrow lines when he comes to the *modus operandi*. If I understand him rightly, he intends to found an institution to be called "Martha Institute." The object of this establishment is to train reliable housekeepers for priests in the United States. Probably its location is to be in Kentucky, and from thence all demands of the country will be supplied. If this be the case, I am of the opinion that it will prove a decided failure. I would suggest that one institution of the kind be established in each ecclesiastical Province of the country. The Ordinaries in each province would have to take the matter in hand in order to make it a success. A priest undertaking such a project, even with the approbation of his bishop, is apt to meet with many serious difficulties. Perhaps the best way to carry out the novel project of training housekeepers for the clergy, would be to give it in charge of already existing communities of religious. They could establish branch houses for that exclusive purpose. In this manner the object in view could be attained without the necessary trouble involved in creating a new religious society. If this latter mode be pursued, nearly each diocese, with a sufficiently large number of priests, could have its own nursery for such training. But let us have other suggestions on this subject. My sole purpose in writing this letter is to prevent a good idea from perishing at its birth. If the novel project live and be carried into effect, it will prove a lasting blessing to a large number of the clergy.

Yours truly,

J. A.—O.S B.

## THE BAPTISM OF BAPTISTS

IN ORDINE AD VALIDITATEM MATRIMONII.

*Qu.* Is the baptism of Baptists presumed to be valid for marriage?

*Resp.* Yes. The *fact* of the baptism being established, even if its *validity* be *doubtful*, confirms the validity of a subsequent marriage, provided there is no other impediment.

“Generatim loquendo, ut christiani habendi sunt ii, de quibus dubitatur, an valide baptizati fuerint.—Censendum est validum Baptisma in ordine ad validitatem Matrimonii.”  
—*S. Offic. 9 Sept., 1868.*

---

## RED CHASUBLE AND WHITE DALMATICS.

*Qu.* We had Solemn Pontifical Mass here recently. The rubric required *red* vestments. As we had no red chasubles I asked the Bishop whether we might use a *white* set instead, rather than omit the solemn function. He thought that, under the circumstances, it might be allowed. Afterwards he told me to send the doubt to the REVIEW. Would you kindly answer it?

*Resp.* No doubt the prudent judgment of a Superior would render a deviation from the ordinary rubric, in such cases, lawful. There is an instance, substantially the same as the above, to be found in the *Collectanea S. Congr. de Propag.*, in which the decision given was: *Arbitris et prudentiae Vicarii Apostolici.* (C. P. pro Sin. 27 Jul. 1850.)

---

## THE LITANY “SS. NOMINIS.”

*Qu.* In reciting the Litany “SS. Nominis” some conclude the final prayer with *Per Dominum nostrum* etc., others with *Qui vivis et regnas* etc. — Is it necessary to say the prayer at all, in order to gain the Indulgence, since no prayer is required with the Litany of Loretto?

*Resp.* The proper ending, according to the authentic *Raccolta*, is *Qui vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum. Amen.* The prayer is *obligatory*, unlike that usually added to the Litany of Loretto.

## BOOK REVIEW.

**CHRIST IN TYPE AND PROPHECY.**—By Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J., Prof. of Oriental Languages in Woodstock College, Md.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago; Benziger Bros. 1893.

When St. John describes to us, in his Gospel, the life and work of the Messiah during the three years of His earthly sojourn, he reminds us at the very outset, not only that He was God, but that He was with God, as the Word to assume flesh in time. He saw the Root of Jesse when the seedling first developed its new life out of the mortification of Adam and Eve in Paradise, casting aside the shell of sin and sprouting through laborious periods a fresh untainted life, one day to be the "arbor vitæ," the tree carrying the most precious fruit of Redemption.

The entire Bible is thus nothing less than a history of the Messiah sketching all the stages of His growth through successive generations until He stands forth as the one all-absorbing figure of creation casting the light of His influence back to the first ages of mankind and forward to the end of time. The Jews realized this fact. The longing for the Redeemer was the one great passion of the devout Hebrew. Even the Pagans felt the influence of the Christ as a wise king, who somehow marked in their imagination a golden age long passed or far away; nay, one of them enlightened beyond the rest by the grace of inspiration and the divine gift of prophecy, Job, tells us: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." (Job, xix, 25.) The Christian sees the Messianic reign accomplished and in the light of the New Testament he understands the purpose of the Old Covenant which in so many ways foreshadowed the kingdom of Christ.

But whilst we know this to be the main scope of the S. Scriptures, we rarely read it with a realization in detail of all the incidents and words pointing out the images, long ago, of the "All Beautiful." This is to miss much of what is useful and interesting in the narratives and lessons of the Old Testament. In the first ages of Christianity the defenders of the Catholic faith appealed to the

Messianic prophecies of the Jewish Bible for confirmation of their belief in the actual advent of Christ. Thus conversions were wrought day by day from the children of Abraham, until the rabbins growing weary of having their interpretation of the Mosaic Covenant discredited, laid aside the version of the Bible used by the Jews in Palestine at the time of our Lord, and pretending to return to the ancient Hebrew text, which had gone out of memory for centuries, created a Masorah and various commentaries of the S. Text, less likely to favor the Christian argument. And the appeals to the Septuagint version against the Jews in the time of the early Apologists of our Catholic faith, have lost nothing of their original force against either Jew or Gentile of to-day, at least from the historical point of view. Beyond this the study of the Messianic character in the S. Scriptures of the Old Testament serves, as Father Maas says: "as a crutch for the feeble in the faith, as an overflowing fountain for the dogmatic theologian, as a topic for the preacher, as a meditation for the devout, as a series of interesting facts for the historian and the psychologist." (Pref.)

It is difficult to imagine a work more thoroughly done than this tracing of the Messianic idea in the Old Testament undertaken by our author. He first develops what has been styled the prophecy-argument, in its history and form. An interesting feature of the latter are the references to such sources as the Sibylline oracles, the apocrypha and the Talmudic and Rabbinic collections. The philosophical truth of the prophecies is clearly shown with just reference and refutation of the criticism of especially the great German biblical rationalists. Historic evidence is everywhere made to support the argument of the existence, the logical coherence, the supernatural character of divine inspiration and the interpretation of the Messianic prophecy. All this is only introductory to the principal subject in which the passages referring to the genealogy, birth, infancy and life work of the Saviour are given and explained with a minuteness of detail, critical skill and that judicious discrimination in disposition of his matter which proves that the scholar aims not at show, but has in mind the endeavor of being useful to his reader. In books of this kind, too, the devout mind of the writer is of special value and can never be without its direct influence in moving the will to follow the suggestions which arise from the contemplation of One whose sole purpose in revealing Himself was to enlighten every man that cometh into this world and to offer him the means of gaining peace of heart in following His teaching.

It would be difficult to single out any particular portion of the work which deserves the attention of the critic. Father Maas leaves us hardly anywhere a way open to object to his exposition, because he remains what the Germans call "objective" throughout. Even in such delicate undertakings as the explanation of the Danielic prophecy we can only applaud the practical wisdom of the author, who without neglecting the influence of many divergent streams of conjecture, arrives at a safe conclusion about the period of years and the nations referred to by the mysterious friend of the inspiring angel. The explanation of the seventh chapter of Isaiah is beautiful and exceptionally satisfactory. The same may be said of the interpretation throughout of the Messianic names.

Biblical scholars will be pleased to find that the author adds an appendix of some thirty pages in which a summary account is given of the Rabbinic Literature which plays so important a part in the discussion of the subject treated in the book. Some of these, such as Myer's *Sabbalah*, will be found to contain further and complete references to all the leading works required by the student.

"Christ in Type and Prophecy," forms one of the permanently valuable books of a theologian's library.

**A TREATISE OF SPIRITUAL LIFE**, Leading man by an easy and clear method from the commencement of conversion to the very summit of sanctity. Translated from the Latin of Mgr. Charles Jos. Morozzo, Cistercian Abbot, and Bishop of Bobbio. Very Rev. D. A. Donovan, O. Cist.—Poplar Bluff, 1893. Published by the author.

In reviewing, some years ago, the Latin edition of this work, so eminently helpful to the priest in his spiritual life, we pointed it out as a book that might serve, in an important branch of moral theology, as a text-book for seminaries no less than a valuable compass by which the director of souls could ever measure his true bearing amid the storms of his active mission. Now that the thoughtful zeal of a priest, trained in the same monastic school as the writer of the book, offers us an English translation, we appreciate doubly its great practical value. Who of us can dare to do the work of saving souls in this nineteenth century, with its complicated modes of self-worship and self-deceit, with its captious advertisements of cant and flattery fearing no longer to invade the sanctuary, —unless he know the secrets of the spiritual warfare by earnest

study and battle with his own inmost soul? Yet this study, this battle, cannot be undertaken without a guide. If ever there was a truth approved by commonest experience it is this: "That no one is endowed with such prudence and wisdom as to suffice for himself in the spiritual life." Yet it is easy enough to blind one's self to this fact, to settle down to a life of present ease, forgetful that we cannot shirk the battle without forfeiting the victory, and finding ourselves in miserable darkness and bondage at the last waking. Thus our intellectual convictions and the truths taught by the constant default of others lose their force in the habitual yielding to the weakness of nature. We need a master who continually holds up before us the awful danger of letting ourselves go down; who plies us not only with motives and arguments apt to persuade the will in striving ahead, but who urges the weary limb with the rod of wholesome fear; to make exertion when sitting down in our benumbed condition would mean certain death.

Our Cistercian proves a first-rate guide. His precepts are reasonable, given in right order, and pithily summed up so as to lodge readily in the mind. He analyzes man in his ordinary state of weakness and sin; shows him what he is bound to, and how much he is capable of, under a right management of himself, warns him of every danger within and without, and lays before him every resource of which he may avail himself to reach securely that region of acquired habits in order and virtue, where the soul feels no longer the dragging weight of the body, which is attracted to the earth only in proportion to its actual nearness to it.

Let us give an instance of how the author presents his lessons in the spiritual life. After having sketched the actual condition of the soul recognizing the necessity of a more perfect spiritual life, and having shown what sort of serenity the impulse to be better, if followed, leads to, he insists upon our viewing closely and fighting with determination the various impediments that beset our path at the beginning. P. Morozzo enumerates twelve principal defects barring the gate of the spiritual life. The first, easily recognized because of its general character, is an inordinate love of self which affects the mind with various images, distracting and disturbing it. This inordinate love shows itself in attachment to money, clothes, books, furniture, to such an extent that we should bear their loss with chagrin.

2. Inordinate delight in food, drink, conversation, jesting, familiarities and such amusements as appeal to the scenes mainly.

3. An over anxiety to avoid temporal and material losses, also an eagerness to escape the troubles which come from the warnings of our conscience and the humiliations which result from sin. On the other hand, a seeking of personal advantage, of popularity, of sensible devotion.

4. An elation of mind which shows itself in arrogance, in an assumption of moral superiority and a sense of condescension.

5. Human respect when it influences habitually our actions.

6. Tenacity of our own opinion and a morbid effort to bring others to our way of thinking and acting, where we are not responsible for the results.

7. Neglect to take account of our ordinary defects, such as a disposition to anger, envy, rash judgments, etc.

8. Indolence and sloth in the performance of spiritual duties.

9. Undue solicitude about the success of our temporal affairs.

10. Scrupulosity and continual harrowing of conscience with attempts to soothe the same by frequent confessions.

11. Excessive application to intellectual work where the mind is exclusively engaged in speculation, whether about sacred or profane sciences.

12. Laying more stress, in the performance of good works, upon their number than upon a pure intention, so as to become involved with a multiplicity of things, which however good, dissipate and unsettle interior recollection. "He that is less in action shall receive wisdom."—(Eccl. xxxviii, 25.)

In such fashion our author groups his thoughts throughout the work, setting forth the sins, pointing out difficulties and their remedies, and leading the will by easy steps of enlightened persuasion to that harmony of the soul with the will of God, which is the essence of true peace and joy even on earth.

The translator has thought it expedient to adhere as closely as possible to the language of the original. This course is probably to be recommended as a guarantee of orthodoxy in the case of works treating of such delicate themes as are involved in the analysis of the spiritual life. In a few instances it has led to obscurities in expression which could have been avoided. Sometimes the terms are not happily selected. Thus, "*De mortificatione ejusque usu*" of the original (P. I, cap. xii) would be more accurately rendered by "The practice of mortification," than by "Mortification and its utility," all the more since the author does not speak in that chapter of the profit which the soul derives from

the exercise of mortification, but only of the manner in which it is to be used.

In the same way such words as *impatibility*, if they have the sanction of English lexicographers at all, are apt to be misunderstood by those who do not know the original Latin equivalent.

Yet it were prudery to call such flaws faults in so good an effort at so good a work as that of making P. Morozzi's book accessible to the English reader. Clergy and seminarist, religious and layman will find it greatly helpful to the attainment of that self knowledge, which is half the victory won over poor human nature, and he who conquers it is truly a king among rational creatures.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

**MISSION WORK AMONG THE NEGROES AND THE INDIANS.**

—Baltimore : Foley Bros. 1894.

**EXPLANATION OF THE GOSPELS AND CATHOLIC WORSHIP.** By Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D., and Rev. Richard Brennan, LL.D.—Benziger Bros : New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1893.

**EASTER MUSIC.**—"Jesus Christ is Risen to-day." (Regina Coeli). D. for S. A. T. B., by M. A. Melvil. Octavo Ed. 20 cents.—"Missa de Angelis." Translated into Modern notation, with organ accompaniment by C. P. Morrison. Octavo Ed. Pr. score 50 cents. Missa "Regina Anglorum," for S. A. T. and B., with organ accompaniment by B. Hamma. Octavo Ed. Pr. score \$1.00. Seven hymns for the different seasons of the year, arr. by B. Hamma. Oct. Pr. 20 cents.—Published by J. Fischer & Bro., 7 Bible House, New York : Ignaz Fischer, 229 Summit Street, Toledo, O. 1894.

**THE FRUIT OF THE VINE.** The essential points in the wine question, etc. By John Ellis, M.D.—New York : The National Temperance Society, and Publication House. 1894.

**GESCHICHTE D. DEUTSCHEN VOLKES** seit Ausgang des Mittelalter's. Von J. Janssen. — Vol VII. Ergänzt u. herausgegeben v. Ludwig Pastor. I-XII edit. — Freiburg, Brigg., 1893. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. — Pr \$2.10.

**DE EFFECTIBUS SACR. EXTREM. UNCTIONIS.** Dissertatio historico-dogmatica. — Ign. Schmitz, S. Th. D. — B. Herder. 1893. — Pr. \$0.70.

**S. DOCTRINAE THOMISTICAE STUDII UTILITAS** demonstrata. P. M. Alexius Maria Lepicier, O. S. B.M.V.—Romae : Typograph. Propag. 1893.



# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.—APRIL, 1894.—NO. 4.

---

## THE GRAND INQUISITOR FR. JEAN BREHAL,

ADVOCATE OF THE "VENER. SERVANT OF GOD," JOAN OF ARC.

*Jean Bréhal, Grand Inquisiteur de France, et la Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc.* Par le R. P. Marie-Joseph Belon, O. P. Prof. de Dogme aux Facultés Cathol. de Lyon, et le R. P. François Balme, O. P. Lect. en Théologie. Paris: P. Lethellieux, Libraire-Editeur, 1893.

IT was through the instrumentality of an unscrupulous and ambitious churchman who sought favor with what was for the time the dominant faction in France, that the saintly and heroic maiden of Domremy was betrayed. The Catholic University of Paris unfortunately seconded the dastardly project, and the innocent victim of domestic intrigues and foreign fanaticism was condemned by an English court and publicly executed on Wednesday, the 30th of May, 1431.

Her death, tragic and beautiful, called forth the sympathy of those who shared her faith and who loved unfortunate France, in defence of whose liberty she had offered her young life; and her martyrdom became at once the seed of a veneration which, after a growth of nearly five centuries, bears in her reception of the title "Venerabilis" the first fair flower of the crown which we may hope will deck the chaste brow of a saint.

Few historians have dared to doubt the injustice of the judgment which pronounced her guilty, and which by its very malice has furnished those striking shadows which

render the golden lustre of her lovely image a lasting triumph. The old records show that even those who had a hand in the work deeply regretted it on seeing it done.<sup>1</sup> As early as 1450 Charles VII, after regaining possession of Paris and Rouen, ordered a revision of the odious process by which the Maid of Orleans had been condemned. The person chosen to conduct the inquest was one William Bouillé, who stood apparently well with all parties, not excluding the University, of which he had been rector in 1439. The examinations would have undoubtedly led to an utter and immediate reversal of all the charges brought against Joanna, if the influence of the English Government, seconded once more by the misrepresentations of the University authorities, had not delayed decided progress of the affair in Rome. The Sovereign Pontiff, Nicholas V, was, moreover, anxious at the time to effect a union between England and France in order to secure Italy against Mussulmanic aggression, a fact which advised a careful avoidance just then of fresh animosities, however much the Pope might have been convinced of the justice of Joanna's cause. Nevertheless, this very caution turned in the end to the benefit of the measure. Nicholas V sent as mediator between the two nations the Cardinal d'Estouteville, a man whose father being of noble Norman blood, whilst his mother was related to Charles VII, was likely to succeed in the difficult mission. But Cardinal d'Estouteville had much more in mind and at heart than to conciliate the Kings, and in his capacity as Papal Legate turned out not only to be a reformer of the modes and teachings of the University, but also a most ardent champion of the cause of Jeanne d'Arc. He had arrived in Lyons on the 14th of December, 1451, before the Bishops of Clermont and Tulle, who had been deputed by the King to meet the Apostolic Delegate, found time to arrive. In the following February we meet him at Tours negotiating with

1 Immediately after the death of the saintly Jeanne d'Arc the executioner came to Friar Isambard de la Pierre, who had assisted and consoled her frequently during the trial, and bitterly deplored his participation in the act, since at heart he believed her to have been wholly innocent and a saint.

Charles VII, who held court there at the time. Toward the end of April, having won the complete confidence of the King, he started for Rouen, and here, in his capacity of representative of the Pope, at once opened in regular canonical form the process of revising the trial of Jeanne d'Arc. According to the proctocol, which gives us the authentic account of the preparatory inquiry into the case, the Delegate did not invite or await any formal accusation or denunciation which would lodge the responsibility of his action upon some plaintiff. He justly claimed the right of canonical investigation on the patent ground that there was a general rumor of an injustice done of which the legate had received cognizance in various ways and at different times. The canonical law revised by Boniface VIII required that in such trials the service of a regular member of the "Inquisition" be employed aside of the usual canonists and jurisconsults. The Cardinal accordingly chose the learned and zealous Jean Bréhal, to whose uninterrupted activity during four years we owe the collation of documentary evidence so complete and decisive as not only to vindicate the innocence of the holy maiden, but to serve as the immediate occasion for establishing the glory of Catholic France in promising to secure the crown of sanctity for one of her daughters who, by the sacrifice of her life, sought to establish her country's safety and honor.

Much might be said of the meaning to be read in the present action of the Church consecrating with the seal of sanctity the virtue of an unstained patriotism and of that heroic womanhood which rises above the ordinary sphere of action by the immediate call of God. But we wish here to call attention rather to the man, hardly known or remembered until very recently, who chiefly aided by his labors in the accomplishment of the glory, which every loyal child of France and every true member of the Catholic Church is glad to see accorded to the "Venerable" Joanna, lovely representative of chivalrous and pure womanhood, who is expected soon to earn the highest title of nobility in being enrolled in the Album of Saints.

Withal, our sketch must necessarily be scant in details.

What we know of the great soul who devoted himself to the work of re-establishing the tarnished fame of our saintly heroine, must be gathered from the work of PP. Belon and Balme before us. These writers in turn rely upon Echard's account, in his *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*,<sup>1</sup> and the Dominican Chapotin's *Études Historiques sur la Province Dominicaine de France*. But apart from the interest which attaches to the person of the Inquisitor, our brief study will show that the Inquisition, which is in most minds associated with judicial proceedings having for their object the laying bare of crime, had another and nobler purpose, namely, that of vindicating right and virtue. If we measure the actual work of the Inquisition as an institute of judicial and ecclesiastical reform, it will be found that, just as in the case of the Venerable Joanna, the good done by the re-establishment of justice and the defense of the innocent far outbalances the errors committed in its name by some of the Church's professed representatives who in acting with injustice or cruelty invariably transgressed the declared purpose and limits which the Inquisition as a disciplinary court of the Church possessed and sanctioned.

Friar Jean Bréhal hailed from Normandy. The exact year of his birth is not known (probably about 1406) nor can it be said with certainty that he was a native of Evreux, where we first meet him in the school of the Dominicans making the seven years' course of studies—two in *Studium artium*, two more in *Studium naturalium*, and three in *Studium theologicum*, followed by four years in the exercise of teaching, as laid down in the traditional programme of academic promotion in the Order.

It was to be expected that at the end of his studies the young Dominican would be sent to the Paris University in order to pass there his regular examination for the Doctorate. This was the usual way. It appears, however, that about the time of his ordination, the University of Caen, which had just been established and endowed by Henry VI with a

1 Quétif et Echard, Tom. I, p. 815.

faculty *utriusque juris* and shortly after possessed additional chairs for the arts and for theology, had obtained a decree forbidding students of the province to go to Paris. Whether the fact that Charles VII had made a gift of the city of Evreux to John Stuart, Earl of Darnley, had anything to do with this prohibition we cannot say, but it appears that Father Jean Bréhal, after finishing his term of *Bachelier* in professing the *studium generale* obtained his doctorate by the favor of the municipal authorities of Evreux. In the archives of the town-hall of that city the following quaint entry is made in the year 1443 :—“ Á religieuse personne et honneste maistre Jehan Bréhal, docteur en théologie, pour don à luy fait par les gens d’église et bourgeois d’icelle ville, pour aider à supporter les frais et mises qui lui conviurent fére quand il fut ordonné et fait docteur, pour ce paíé par le commendement et ordonnance diceulx gens d’église et bourgeois la somme de dix salus d’or, pour ce IX 1.”<sup>1</sup>

The fact that soon after we find him engaged in the important position of superior of a house of his Order in Paris, and his appointment there by the Holy See as Inquisitor General of France gives ample testimony to the high order of his moral and intellectual acquirements. He could hardly have passed much beyond the requisite age for so responsible an office as that of Inquisitor, to which none who had not attained his fortieth year was eligible, whatever his reputation for ability might be in other respects. The qualifications demanded for the office of Inquisitor are summed up by Pope Urban IV in his bull *Prae cunctis*.<sup>2</sup> The candidate must possess the highest reputation for blameless morality, that is to say, he is not only to be free from all imputations against his

1 Préludes du procès, pag. 10, not. 3.

2 “Providimus igitur ibidem ad praesens personas aliquas circumspetas pro tanto negotio deputari, quarum honesta conversatio exemplum tribuat puritatis (pietatis?), et doctrinam fundant labia salutarem, ut sacro ipsarum ministerio praefatae partes ab hujusmodi contagiis expurgentur. Quatenus in charitate Dei hominum timore postposito, virtutem spiritus induentes ex alto, praedictum officium, etc.” 28 Jul., 1261. *Eymeric. Direct Inquisit.*

honor, but to be universally recognized as endowed with noble character and virtuous qualities; he is to possess prudence in an eminent degree; to be of unshaken firmness in maintaining the right, gifted with a habit of generous charity so as to direct his zeal for the good of all, and of a mind equipped with wisdom and knowledge.

Bernardus Gui, in his "Practica Inquisitionis," has drawn out at greater length the qualities of mind and heart which should adorn a member of the Inquisition. It is a noble picture, the details of which it would occupy us too long here to describe; suffice it to say that the office demands a rare combination of such virtues as make princes who sit in judgment beloved by the best portion of their people and honored by those who have no heart for gratitude. The biographer of Jean Bréhal gives ample illustration to show that the young Prior of the Paris Community possessed these gifts in a high degree. They were indeed called forth on more than one occasion when a less sagacious and less courageous temper than that of Bréhal would have despaired of the cause of right.

Students of history are familiar with the extraordinary influence exercised by the University of Paris about the time of which we speak. Unfortunately the authorities of this potent intellectual centre failed at times to use their prestige in the right direction. Apart from the jealousy with which they regarded the success of the mendicant Orders whose disciples had succeeded in combining their efforts in the domain of letters, there were certain privileges of which the Paris University, as the oldest public teaching corporation in Europe claimed exclusive possession. Now and then the Popes granted to the Religious Orders exemptions and rights of a nature to diminish that autocracy in settling controversies and conferring degrees to which the University had laid exclusive or undisputed claim. On one occasion the Regents of the University solemnly interdicted the publication of one of these privileges by the Dominicans, declaring the document spurious and citing the Friars before the academic tribunal. Prior Jean Bréhal on this occasion assumed the

defence of not only his own Order but of all the religious Communities in France which had suffered from the arrogant assumptions of the University. Instead of presenting himself, however, as a defendant against an unfounded charge, he stated the privileges and rights granted the Orders by the Holy See, and in a dignified and calm manner demanded a full and open recognition of these in the name of the Pope. He pointed out that the Dominicans together with the other mendicant Orders had rendered singular service to their country in the cause of letters. If they claimed the exercise of the function which had hitherto been monopolized by the University on the plea of public grant, they did so without encroachment upon the right of the University and they did not expect or ask its sanction. He referred them to Rome and in the meantime gave to understand that he meant to maintain the privileges of the Order as a teaching faculty. The Paris authorities were astonished at the position taken by the comparatively young Prior. They treated it as an insult to their illustrious body. He had moreover, spoken in French, instead of using, according to academic custom, the Latin, which seemed to indicate a sort of contempt of their learned prerogatives. But Bréhal remained unmoved; he had gained his principal point in making them understand that they had to deal with a man who was fully aware of the justice of his pretensions. Through the intervention of the Augustinian Prior, who was presented to speak for his Order, a compromise was for a time effected by recognizing some of the academic rights of the Mendicants. Several months later complete recognition was granted to the Dominicans.

Bréhal had on another occasion emphasized his determination not to be swayed by human considerations in the exercise of his functions as Inquisitor General of France. One of the Professors of the University had publicly taught and sustained certain erroneous propositions on points of Catholic doctrine. Bréhal promptly cited him before his tribunal to answer for his conduct. The entire University rose up in arms against such an act, but our Inquisitor, whilst

expressing himself quite prepared to have the matter concluded in an amicable way and to recognize the position of the University as a *magisterium* of theology in France, insisted with iron determination that the norm of Catholic doctrine was decided not by the Paris University but by the Holy See and that the right to teach emanated from the Head of the Church by whom the Inquisition had been instituted to check the vagaries of individual teachers. Of that Inquisition he (Bréhal) was the rightful representative, a position which did not allow him to make distinctions between university professors and others who might propagate error under the name and prestige of the Catholic religion.

In the preface of an erudite work which Bréhal wrote in order to refute a false doctrine regarding sacramental jurisdiction which had been advanced by some secular professors imbued with the principles of William de Saint-Amour, the author is styled *vigilantissimus inquisitor* by the superior who procures the edition. He himself gives evidence of the spirit which animated him throughout the composition of the book held in high estimation as a solid, temperate and learned defence of the Catholic teaching on the subject which it treats. "I have consulted," he says in the concluding chapter, "to the best of my humble capacity, the interests of truth, set forth, with all sobriety and charity; and in doing so I have kept ever before me as my light and truest model that sole infallible rule, Him, who is the Way and the Truth and the Light. May He be blessed for ever and ever. Amen." Malbrancq (de Morinis) mentions a work from the pen of Bréhal regarding the origin of some monastic institutions, although the MS. is not known to exist.

But what most concerns us here is Jean Bréhal's activity as Inquisitor in the affairs relating to the trial and condemnation of the Venerable Jeanne d'Arc. Independently of his official capacity as Chief of the Inquisition in France, which charge he held until the end of 1474, when Jean Watat, of the convent of Châlons succeeded him, there could hardly have been found in France a man more according to the heart of



Cardinal d'Estouteville and one more zealous and successful in vindicating the honor of France and the Church by placing the case of the martyr heroine in its just light. During the four years, from 1452-1456, he labored incessantly in collecting the evidence which has become the chief and most reliable source of documentary information to be used in the process of canonization now under action at Rome.

We do not propose here to enter into the details of the process, the endless journeys and personal inquests, the lengthy reports made for the benefit of the different civil and religious authorities, together with the attestations of churchmen and officials in various parts of France, Italy and Austria. All these things may be found in the first two books of the work placed at the head of this article. The labor of Jean Bréhal which calls for our special attention is the *Recollectio* written by himself and now published complete, after careful correction, according to the original manuscript, by PP. Belon and Balme. The importance of this document had for a long time been underestimated. It seems that Quicherat, in writing his history of the process, had been influenced by the statement of a doctor of the Sorbonne, Edmund Richer, to the effect that the regests of Bréhal were an erudite but practically worthless collection of dissertations in jurisprudence and theology, called forth by the investigation without shedding much light upon the facts. Others accepted the statement without satisfying themselves of its accuracy until the learned and judicious Marius Sepet corrected the error by placing the worth of Bréhal's summary in its true light. M. Lanery d'Arc in his *Memoires et Consultations en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc*, and last of all, but most effectively, the Jesuit Father Ayroles in his recently published *La Vraie Jeanne d'Arc*, have done full justice to the great Inquisitor and patron of our saintly heroine by citing at length many parts of the *Recollectio* and giving a fair analysis of the entire labor. It is not to be denied that a very large part of the work may be styled a memoir of jurisprudence and theology, withal closely pertinent to the subject of which the process treats; but it is in this that we find established the

true principles upon which serious judgments must be conducted. Beyond this, however, there is an abundance of facts and a care of detail regarding the procedure, in which, to use the words of the late editors of the *Recollectio*, "Bréhal fournit à l'historien des matériaux authentiques—les faits consignés au dossier, contrôlés par conséquent avec une rigoureuse exactitude—et une appréciation solidement motivée, dont il est loisible d'éprouver la justesse, mais qu'on peut accepter de prime-abord, au moins sous bénéfice d'inventaire." (Liv. III, p. 100.)

The first nine chapters of the work of Bréhal are taken up with what the author calls the *matter* of the process, in which the previous charges made by the English court are successively analyzed and their solidity tested. The history of these charges is well known from books and review articles. But Bréhal treats them from the juridical and philosophical point of view; he enters into the motive, the psychological aspect of the case, so as to justify the extraordinary position of this maiden, who was evidently compelled to her course of beneficent heroism by some supernatural agency, which no circumstance in her life allows us to doubt was any other than divine.

The second part of the *Recollectio* deals with the *form* of the previous process. It consists of twelve chapters and sets forth in the first place the incompetency of the judge, as represented mainly in the person of an unprincipled bishop, who, without ecclesiastical jurisdiction, having become a renegade to his own land and king, and having offered and received bribes, outraged every sense of justice and honor by the high-handed manner in which he uttered sentence. It is shown how he acted throughout on the testimony of vague rumors and false suspicion, on partial and contradictory evidence, and under traitorous influence, abused his sacred office and employed the name and authority of the Church to gain his personal ends.

In his argument Bréhal proceeds upon strictly scholastic lines. He outlines the scope of a judicial sentence by defining the meaning of the word "judicium," and thence

circumscribes the duty of a judge. "The legality of a judgment has its foundation in the fact that it is an act of justice. In order that a judgment be an act of justice three things principally are required in the person who assumes the right of exercising judgment. First, he must possess authority of jurisdiction or, in other words, the right to preside in the court. Secondly, his action in judgment must rest upon definite and certain evidence, and in estimating it he must follow right reason and prudence. Thirdly, he must be actuated by the motive of doing justice. If any of these three conditions be wanting, the judgment is vitiated and unlawful."<sup>1</sup>

In like manner all the evidence is sifted according to the strict method of the Angelic Doctor which admits of no equivocation, no misuse of terms, no insertion of captions by which the mind of the jury might be prejudiced or the judgment led astray through eloquent sophistry. In many places he uses the very words of St. Thomas and of that master in the art of uncompromising logic, Aristotle. All the shrewdly woven texture which served to veil the truth is torn apart, shred upon shred. Then thread after thread is turned industriously to the full light of the sun, until its dark side uppermost becomes a background for the fair fame of that lovely image, the white flower with ruby crown, representing the maiden saviour of France.<sup>2</sup>

1 Ideoque in tantum iudicium est licitum, in quantum est actus justicie. Ut autem iudicium sit actus justicie, tria potissimum requiruntur, in eo scilicet qui assumit exercere iudicium. Primum est, quod procedat ex auctoritate jurisdictionis seu presencie. Secundum est, quod agat et moveatur ex certitudine, et secundum rectam rationem presencie. Tercium est, quod inducatur ex inclinatione justicie. Unde si quodcumque horum defuerit, iudicium utique viciosum erit et illicitum. Texte de la *Recollectio*, cap. I.

2 The chapters of the second part of the *Recollectio*, the quaint orthography of which we reproduce as in the original, run in the following order: I. De incompetencia iudicis, maxime episcopi qui processum deduxit. II. De iudicantis episcopi inordinato et corrupto affectu, ac ejusdem severitate. III. De incommoditate carcerum ac custodum ejus. IV. De recusatione iudicis, et sufficienti provocatione seu appellatione ad papam. V. De subinquire, ac ejus diffugio, et metu sibi illato. VI. De articulorum

We have already mentioned how important the work of P. Bréhal is both from a historical point of view as also in evidence to the argument for canonization now being conducted by the S. Congregation at Rome. It is a plea of unimpeachable candor and strength, so that one is forced to concur with the opinion of the editors expressed in the chapter entitled *Étude critique du Manuscrit*, speaking of the work as "Un travail remarquable par la solidité de sa doctrine théologique et canonique, par la sûreté de ses appréciations et de ses résonnements, par la richesse et l'abondance des citations de toute sorte dont il est émaillé."

The judges, ecclesiastical and civil, of whom the official text mentions eleven, accepted the report in evidence as complete and unquestionable. The former judgment was reversed and the court which had pronounced it was publicly censured. This final act took place on July 7th, 1456. The result was communicated to King Charles at his residence in Bourbonnais, and the joy proclaimed throughout France caused festive celebrations everywhere, particularly at Rouen and Orleans where, as is noted by the historian, Jean Bréhal presided among princes and prelates. The next step to be taken was to inform the venerable pontiff Calixtus III of the result. Had that Pope been free to act amid the political difficulties which pressed upon him for solution,<sup>1</sup> not only in Italy, but throughout the continent and in England, which had failed to improve the chances of her previous conquest, the humble maid of Domremy might have received her crown of canonization ere now. Jean Bréhal and Guillaume Bouillé, who had assisted him all through the process of

falsitate, et corrupta eorum compositione. VII. De qualitate revocacionis seu abjuracionis quam Johanna facere impulsa fuit. VIII. De pretensu relapsu contra Johannam. IX. De interrogantibus, ac difficilibus interrogatoriis Johanne factis. X. De defensoribus de exhortatoribus, deque accessoribus, atque de predicantibus, processui intervenientibus. XI. De deliberantibus in causa, seu determinacionibus eorum quoad capitula causae. XII. De qualitate sentencie et diffinicionis processus. Text Recoll.

<sup>1</sup> Calixtus had just sent Cardinal Allain de Coëtivy as special legate to the court of Charles VII to solicit the aid of France against the Turk. The Legate was at this time in Avignon. Liv. V, chap. iii, p. 164.

investigation, were commissioned to lay the whole matter before Calixtus. We are only told of the Pontiff's joy at the rehabilitation of her whom the people of France spontaneously honored as a saint.

Jean Bréhal had accomplished what we may justly consider the most important work of his life; but he was obliged to retain the office of Grand Inquisitor for eighteen years more. At length, when he had attained the age of three score and ten, he might have hoped to be permitted to retire to the beloved abode of his earlier years, the convent of Evreux. God wished him to meet there the odium and irregularities against which he had all these years set his face by the vigilant measures of reform which he had undertaken outside of his own community. The spirit of insubordination caused by war and schism, above all by the contentious attitude of the Paris University, which fostered it beyond her own circle, had left its influence upon society and the clergy. Disorders and general laxity had crept into the Religious Orders. Claude Bruno, the Provincial of the Dominicans in France, saw the evil and its destructive progress and determined upon a reform in his own community. To carry out the measures of rigorous discipline which were found necessary for this purpose, he selected Jean Bréhal, whose experience, zeal for the good of religion, and strong yet gentle character pointed him out as a secure reformer. The aged monk accepted the charge as one who knows no higher motive for action than that dictated by obedience in the cause of virtue. He had but few years to live, but that these were spent in energetic and efficient labor for the reform of his Order, is evident from the record of his work preserved in the archives of the community at Rome. The Superior General, Léonard de Mansuetis, had given him letters patent for the full exercise of authority in matters pertaining to the religious reform approved and urged by Rome. Bréhal began, as was to be expected, the restoration of ancient discipline at his own convent of Evreux. A letter dated from Rome, April 1, 1477, confirms all he has done and praises alike his zeal and his prudence. In the following

year (December 5th, 1478) the reform, though gradually introduced, began to show its fruits in the exemplary conduct of the monks of Evreux. The General Chapter of the Order, held in 1479 at Perugia, not only attests in its documents the religious regeneration effected through the care and wisdom of the venerable Bréhal, but set the community of Evreux as an example to be imitated by all the other convents. To guarantee a continuance of this work, Jean Bréhal was appointed Vicar to the Master General, charged in an especial manner to watch over the reforms previously introduced. "Magister Johannes Bréhalli fuit factus vicarius super suo conventu Ebroicensi jam reformato, *cum plenissima potestate ad manutenendam reformationem*, et maxime communitatem camerarum, terminorum, pecuniarum et aliarum rerum, et potest Priorem absolvere et confirmare, et fratres expellere inutiles, et bonos recipere. Dat. Romæ, 5 dec. 1478." *Archiv. Ord. Romæ: Reg. II Magistri Léon de Mansuetis, fo. 18.*

Such was the man to whose faithful and enlightened industry we owe the testimony which establishes not only the innocence but the heroic sanctity of the Maid of Orleans. That testimony might never have come to us so definite, so unimpeachable and so complete, had the Grand Inquisitor of France been a person of different stamp. There were many witnesses to prove the true character of Jeanne d'Arc, the people as a body were enthusiastic in their veneration of her, the King and the Pope, all believed her to be the victim of foul calumny—yet all this might have been inefficient in a court of canonization, as it would be even in a court of law; for there was powerful opposition not only of individuals but above all of the University which exercised a determined influence in such proceedings. Only the most fearless champion of truth and honor would lay himself open, as Bréhal did, to the vindictive animosity of such forces. "No doubt," says his biographer, "at the approach of his death he rejoiced and felt fortified by the recollection of the labors undertaken in behalf of Jeanne d'Arc. The gratitude of that saintly martyr was assured him, whilst men bless his memory,

because he devoted himself, more than any one else, to the work of restoring her to her rightful place in history<sup>1</sup>." Thanks to these efforts the regret expressed by Delavigne in the last line of his beautiful poem on the death of Jeanne d'Arc will soon, we may hope, be rendered void by her canonization.

Venez, jeunes beautés, venez braves soldates,  
Semez sur son tombeau les lauriers et les roses !  
Qu'un jour le voyageur, en parcourant ces bois,  
Cueille un rameau sacré, l'y dépose et s'écrie :  
A celle qui sauva le trône et la patrie,  
Et n'obtint qu'un tombeau pour prix de ces exploits !

THE EDITOR.

---

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL EDUCATION.

THERE was a lecture delivered once in Philadelphia by Rev. Albert Barnes, a Presbyterian. It was a plea in behalf of the colleges in the West ; and, in the course of his remarks, not a few of his reflections bore upon priests, Jesuits and Sisters : " I am not afraid of priests," he cried. " A mere priest, in such a country as this is a poor creature. Let the priest come ; and, in the climate of our freedom, with a free pulpit and a free press and free schools, and with the fountains of free and manly thoughts in our seats of higher education, it will be seen that priestcraft is not a thriving business. But deliver us from the Jesuit professor—the Popish teacher—forming the minds, and shaping the entire intellectual and moral character of those who are to direct the opinions of the masses of our people. A Sister of Charity, teaching French and music and such like things, in a nunnery boarding-school, is a mightier agent than a priest with his Latin prayers and his maledictions and his holy water."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Liv. I, ch. ii, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> A plea in behalf of Western Colleges ; a discourse delivered before the Society for promoting collegiate and theological education in the West, in the First Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J., October 29, 1815 ; and in the First Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, February 22, 1846 ; by Albert Barnes.

To our mind, the most interesting feature of this declamation is the fact that it was delivered half a century ago. At a distance from us longer than the usual span of life, it put forth in 1845 what an Episcopal Bishop, of western New York, might be conceived to say, and in sooth, is actually declaiming in 1894. The solemn warning was rehearsed in the Presbyterian churches of Newark and Philadelphia; and with a correct appreciation of its pregnant eloquence, the board of the society which listened to it, disseminated the gentleman's wisdom from the publishing houses, not only of Philadelphia, but also of New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis.

The pronouncements contained in the address were lugubrious in their tone as to the past, present and future of Protestant education. Yet they were triumphant in their refutation of Catholic pretensions and Catholic assumptions, and emphatic in their disapproval of Catholic success, forty-eight years ago. Speaking of the Sisters and the Jesuits, he said: "If they are to monopolize the higher education of the West; if they are to have the conceded reputation of giving the best education, they win the field. Then where are we as a people? . . . There is no error more prevalent than that of overrating the advantages of Catholic seminaries of learning; and the causes of that error it would not be difficult to state." He makes some statements; and his sense of honesty and truth seems to feel no difficulty at all in making them, nor scruple in pretending to believe them. Then with a supreme effort of rhetoric and logic, he sweeps his own fallacies triumphantly away: "Yet we may ask, and the question will not soon be answered, wherein this country is there a Jesuit college that, for purposes of educating the youth of this land for the duties of American citizenship, can be compared with Yale, or Harvard, or Dartmouth, or Princeton? There is not one!"

He winds up his indictment of Catholic excellence in these weighty terms: "Colleges and schools and seminaries for both sexes there will be (in the mighty West); and one thing is clear; unless we can establish institutions of learning that shall be of as high an order of scholarship, and as cheap as



the Jesuits, the issue will not be doubtful. That we *can* do it, no one can doubt; if we *will* do it, the West is safe; our country is safe; the cause of liberty and Protestantism in the world is safe."

Here then it would appear that the cause of higher education was trembling in the balance, half a century ago; and that on a scale of national proportions. Grammar school education was as yet in a state of infancy and innocence. But, as the great mechanism into which it has since been forced rose in all its gaunt proportions, and the proportionately vast parochial school system stood up side by side with it, or face to face, the two seem to have assumed the same mutual relations of comparative excellence, which had marked the attitude of higher education on one side and the other. No doubt, the gift of technical genius has invented a better means of financial supply than taking up voluntary collections in Presbyterian churches; and like all advanced mechanism, the supply valves of a forced taxation work more automatically and less capriciously than the pulses of a free and parental system. Still, while the financial advantages have been all on one side, it would really seem as if the mutual relations in point of respective excellence had not materially changed between the two sides. Let us mention what may be taken as a little illustration.

In the month of December, 1893, we read the following in one of the high-class reviews of the country, a periodical devoted entirely to the pedagogics of the State system: "It is not a pleasant confession to make, but the American teacher cannot write good English; that is, the average teacher cannot. The *Educational Review* receives scores of manuscripts every month, not a few of them written by teachers of more than a merely local reputation, which, if printed, would ruin the reputation of their authors forever . . . Unfortunately, our national shortcoming has been noticed abroad as well as at home. Only a few weeks since, a well-known English critic pointed to two new American books on education—both written by men of prominence—and asked how it was possible that two such atrociously

written books could find a publisher . . . Another eminent authority on the use of words recently sent to the *Educational Review* a list of more than one hundred violations of good usage, all taken from a single school-book written by a man who has made his mark in literature. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes ?*<sup>1</sup>”

The one pleasant feature we note in this unpleasant confession is that neither Sisters nor Jesuits are indicted as responsible for the appalling disaster—this disaster of national decadence—reflecting on past time when the present illustrious victims of illiteracy were seated on the benches at the feet of incompetent teachers, and reaching forward to future time, when the hapless generation now seated under incompetent teachers will radiate an accumulated ignorance, for the benefit of generations to come. *Qualis magister, talis discipulus*. With thanks we record it, that “Popish teachers” are not summoned to the bar for bewitching the world with pedagogical ignorance. Nor indeed were they so indicted by the Rev. Albert Barnes, forty-eight years ago. Then they stood arraigned for precisely the counter-charge of threatening to impound all national excellence in Catholic schools and seminaries. Have they perhaps done so, and that to such a degree of rapacious cruelty, as not to leave a scrap of good English in the rifled pockets of their competitors? English! Hear it! We should have expected algebra, or drawing, or even possibly biology to go first. May be, they are gone into shreds; and English was the last piece supposed to be whole. But it is whole no more; and who shall patch it?

According to the canons of approved polemics, a sacred silence is generally observed with regard to Catholic education. Institutions which are under Catholic management do sometimes figure in statistical tables of incomes, foundations, salaries, and the like. And we must confess our deep confusion at beholding what a nonentity the Church seems to be, when there is question of money, buildings, professor-

ships ! Outside of this little compliment so paid to us, a pall of silence rests over all. And when, as in the late Columbian year, there was no helping it, but Catholic institutions were heard from, and were seen, still the degree of cultivation to which the silence was carried almost equalled that of the pedagogical culture, altogether too conspicuous in the convents and parochial schools. Silence is a fine art in what is called "national" education. And, not to dally too long with introducing what we have to say in this paper, we shall come to the point at once, and make bold to observe the following historical facts, which, like other useful things, are buried in the dead silence of all the pedagogical literature of our time :—

In the first place, what is called national instruction is in a state of decadence, whatever be the country to which we turn our eyes. Secondly, distinguishing education from mere instruction, we say that there is no national education going on at present, outside of the Church. Thirdly, there is and there has been national education ; and it is all the work of the Catholic Church.

The first point is readily shown. Decadence in the results of instruction in Germany, decadence in France, decadence in Italy is the theme of dolorous monologues, and the subject of parliamentary animadversion, on the part of publicists, and demagogues, of deputies and pedagogues in all those countries. The modern secular movement in public instruction has affected England the same way. And, notwithstanding tables of "Illiterates and otherwise," the United States seem not to be out of line with the rest.

The second point refers to education as distinct from mere secular instruction. According to all accepted definitions, education means instruction and very much more. It signifies the development of all faculties, moral as well as intellectual ; and the moral more than the intellectual. For a man is always a man, if he is morally right and good. He is less than a man, and had preferably have been made a useful animal, if he is only equipped intellectually, to do moral evil more exquisitely. To this definition one serious

class of professional writers practically demur. They are the agriculturists and industrialists, who see in man only the best machine in the market, and consider instruction to be adequate, to be all education, if this human machine is made supple and agile, is tempered by gymnastics and made splendid by physical culture, and then is mounted on the rest of the machinery, like what they call a "governor" in engineering, to regulate all at a moderate expense.

Education does not exist outside of the Church's direct influence. For there is no power to teach, inform and mould the moral man, outside of the means which are invested in the Catholic Church alone. Systems of national and secular instruction bear the same relation to moral development, which technical knowledge in the mind bears to the passions and emotions of the human heart, almost the same relation as running a machine or turning a sentence to an act of contrition or of divine love. To be sure, running a machine or learning grammar may be made an act of moral and sublime virtue. But it takes the Church and her divine means to temper the human heart, so as to produce this or any other form of practical moral life.

The ministry of the sacraments is most directly efficacious, for they produce the life within. The ministry of teaching is most indispensable, for no one comes within reach of the sacraments, unless he is first taught. Hence St. Paul argues, that to be saved men must believe; "and how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard?" (Rom. x, 14.) The ministrations of the priests are void for want of subjects, unless his teaching has predisposed them. And, if we are to compare one kind of teaching with another, what is he who preaches to the adult, contrasted with him who instructs the young? The Abbé Bourdoise wrote to M. Olier, founder of St. Sulpice: "For my part, I assure you from the bottom of my heart, that I would beg from door to door to provide for a true schoolmaster. . . . I believe that a priest who was possessed of the science of the saints would make himself a schoolmaster, and so come to the honors of canonization. The best masters, the greatest, those most in credit,

the Doctors of the Sorbonne, would not be too good for this work. Because parish schools are poor, and kept by the poor, people imagine they are nothing. Yet it is the one means for destroying vices and planting virtue; and I defy all men together to find a better." Hence the Rev. Albert Barnes touched on a fine truth, with a penetration quite worthy of the spirit of evil in this world, when he said, as quoted above: "A Sister of Charity, teaching music and French and other such things, in a nunnery boarding-school, is a mightier agent than a priest with his Latin prayers and his maledictions and his holy water." We know what the priest can do, and how he alone can do it. It is clear what a Catholic teacher does, a work of preparation indispensable to the ministry. What wonder there should be no education going on outside of the Catholic Church—neither national nor private education!

Thirdly; has there never been what may be called national education, and is there none now? If we understand what is meant by the term "national" we shall see that it has been in progress for a long time, and it is thriving to-day.

The term "nation" has two meanings, one good and the other bad. It is a decidedly objectionable use of the word to designate by it whatever comes from a bureau, a minister, a committee of parliament or a department of State. There is some color for the usage, since these are institutions pertaining to the nation, salaried by the nation, and in other ways "national." But is every notion that emanates from the heads of the incumbents forthwith a "national" notion? Does every measure of theirs emanate from the bosom of the nation, and return with multiplied interest to the heart of the nation? In the present sense of human kind there is scarcely an idea more restricted, narrow, partisan, and possibly tyrannical, than that which is conveyed by the word "bureaucratic!" Yet by a ready fallacy the designation "national" which may or may not belong to the bureau, is slipped over to the measures which are propounded by the idiosyncracies of the bureau. Thus a minister of public

instruction, a department of education, excogitates a programme for the schools, devises a great system of schooling. And all at once it is NATIONAL. More correctly, it ought to be called revolutionary; since this phase of public administration began with the great Revolution. France, which inaugurated the European Revolution, inaugurated likewise this style of national administration, and of national instruction. And it has all been revolution ever since—in education as well as in everything else. For, in about a dozen years, Fourcroy had reason to report to Napoleon that the student classes knew no longer anything, not even orthography. In a little over a hundred years they have perpetrated their twenty-first official or national programme. And by all accounts the student classes are not only innocent of Latin, but also of French. . . . This is what comes of “national” education, when the term is employed to designate bureaucratic programmes, printed at the cost of the public exchequer and merely imposed by the force of the national executive.

But, let us take the word “national” in its true and good signification, as indicating what grows up in the hearts and manners of a people, what is part of their natural and moral life; and, if perfected by a discreet application of the canons of art, is so perfected only in accordance with the dictates of conscience, the right of individuals, and the aspirations of an upright nature towards virtue and enlightenment. Applied in this sense among a Christian people, the term “national education” means the formation of a Christian character in the young, instruction in religion, and advancement in secular branches of learning harmoniously with the principles, incentives and practice of Christian faith and morality. In this sense, the Church alone can impart or foster such education. It is the Church that introduced it into the world. Wherever she is, there she conducts or stimulates this and no other form of education. And, if any people have cut themselves off from the Catholic Church, and have so far forfeited her privileges, not the least part of forfeit consists in this, that, having received the gift of

national development and life which came only with her civilization, they are left without the appanage of true national education, which cannot go on without the rest.

The history of her method and means, among the nations, in accomplishing so integral a part of her civilizing mission may be indicated briefly; though a prolonged and accurate consideration were necessary to estimate her zeal, to appreciate her policy, and to learn the lessons of practical philosophy which shine forth in her conduct of the schools. We shall say just a word on the progress of elementary education, chiefly with regard to boys.

The reins of public instruction, through the instrumentality of the clergy and especially of the monks in their monasteries, were already well in hand, when the Third Ecumenical Council of Lateran, held in 1179, made it a subject of universal legislation, that every cathedral church should maintain a master to bestow gratuitous instruction on ecclesiastics and poor scholars. In the Fifth Ecumenical Council of Lateran, presided over by Leo X, a similar decree was formulated with this reason assigned, "because the Church of God, like a pious mother, is bound to provide for the indigent, in matters which regard either the help of the body or the profit of the soul." The next Ecumenical Council, that of Trent, began in its fifth session to treat questions of education. Every cathedral church had to provide a chair of theology. If the smallness of the revenues and the fewness of scholars did not justify such a foundation "at least the Bishop and Chapter must have masters to teach grammar to ecclesiastical students and poor scholars gratis."

The decrees of provincial councils followed on all sides. And what, in the natural course of things, was in any case the next stage in the civilization of Europe—a general, universal education of the young—was stimulated by formal enactments, was sanctioned by ecclesiastical penalties, and thus became a regular part of the Church's discipline wherever she exercises control.

There were three classes of persons on whom the labor of

education devolved—the secular clergy, the laity and the religious orders or congregations. On the secular clergy having the care of souls it rested as an ecclesiastical duty. Catholic lay persons came in to assist them, assuming this work as one of devotion and zeal, if it happened to suit their tastes. Finally religious orders sprang into existence with a special view to this work ; and, receiving their authorization from the Holy See or from Bishops, entered with organized forces, united and diffusive, upon the field of education. This was only a new phase of an old work, long familiar in its earlier and less organized stages to the ancient orders

France, which was to be the arena of revolution in teaching, as well as in everything else, furnishes a specimen of how the secular clergy carried out the ecumenical and synodal decrees. Numerous provincial councils, beginning at the end of the sixteenth century, required that a master should be provided in every parish to teach children their religion with grammar. During the two centuries which followed, the synodal statutes contain the wisest instructions for teachers, the most pressing recommendations, with ordinances ever recurring and enjoining an increase in the number of schools. Bishop Huet, in 1694, ordained that no ecclesiastic should be admitted to discharge the functions of Vicar in a parish, except on condition of keeping the schools, when required to do so by his Curé. Conformably with the rules of the Church, he commanded that Curés should keep little schools for the instruction of children ; this they should do in person, or through their Vicars, or other persons of virtue and capacity. Mgr. De Tesse, the Bishop of Coutances, in 1682, prescribing the acquisition of reading and writing as simultaneous with learning the practices of piety and religion, adds the reason that the children “ may be in a condition to sing the praises of God, and to protect themselves from the deceptions which are only too frequent among men.” The visitation of their diocese by successive Archbishops of Bourdeaux included an accurate and minute inspection of the parish schools.

In this way, the pious persons of both sexes who, remain-



ing in the world, devoted themselves to the assistance of the clergy as teachers in the schools, became objects of special solicitude to the Bishops. The Bishop of Chalons, Mgr. Vialart de Herse, cousin of M. Olier, issued an ordinance in 1676, enjoining a spiritual retreat on all the masters of his diocese. The retreat was conducted in the seminary at the expense of the Prelate, who preached to them himself, and had them otherwise instructed in the important duties of their profession. He composed a book, *L'École Chrétienne*, containing meditations for teachers, with instructions and directions. This, with another book of chants, he distributed throughout his diocese.

Such a system of universal education required money, and much of it. Two sources were open. One is referred to when mention is made of parents paying the "accustomed tax," for the support of the schools of the parish. The other was the more important and ample source of funds. It was the liberal endowment of Christian schools, as an eminent work of piety on the part of both clergy and laity. A new channel was opened for the usual liberality of the faithful, who from the beginning of Christendom had built churches and monasteries, had founded colleges and works of mercy. These gifts are the expression in terms of temporal goods of that same spirit of sacrifice which prompts the religious orders to bestow, in charity and mercy, their personal service and undivided labors for life.

Thus we find Bishops and priests consecrating their fortunes and the revenues of their benefices to the endowment of gratuitous schools. In some cases, schools were created at the cost of the ecclesiastical benefices themselves; inasmuch as the incumbents allowed their livings to be extinguished, to the end that the fruits thereof might be applied to so good a work. Instances are quoted from Brittany. We can understand that the devout laity were not behindhand, with such examples set before them by their pastors.

However, the secular clergy, even though seconded by the laity, could not apply themselves with undivided attention to so laborious a ministry as education. They were taken

up with the active care of souls in other ways. All their vigilance could not succeed in keeping secular schoolmasters up to the level of so high a profession. Hence the religious life, active from the beginning of the Church in so many fields of zeal, now yielded a new form of orders and congregations, institutes especially established for teaching, either as the exclusive, or at least as a principal object of their vocation.

As early as the fourteenth century, a canon of Deventer, Gerard Groot, began the apostolate which, in the seventeenth century, the Bl. de la Salle was to carry on with such signal fruit for the Church. Groot had founded a community of clerics, called Brothers of the Common Life, who instructed children in reading, writing, religion and some mechanical arts. From the Netherlands, where they commenced, these Brothers extended their labors along both sides of the Rhine, through Westphalia, Saxony, Pomerania, Switzerland, Silesia. Later on came the Doctrinaires, founded at Cavaillon, in 1592, by the Ven. Cæsar de Bus. Then the Brethren and Fathers of the Pious Schools were founded at Rome by St. Joseph Calasanctius in 1597; and these spread from Italy into Germany, and as far as Poland, even in the life-time of their founder. In 1604, a Vicar-General at Lyons, M. Démià, and some others elsewhere, endeavored to constitute schoolmasters themselves into pious communities; but without success. The profession and practice of religious perfection, under the sanction of the vows, has alone been successful in this field of enterprise. Finally, the Abbé de la Salle applied himself to the work, and founded the Congregation of Brothers of the Christian Schools. Himself a man of quality, a dignitary of the Church, he began by extending his protection and largesses to some poor schoolmasters, and ended by making himself poor and a schoolmaster for the poor. He succeeded so well in his divine work, that, when the revolution of 1789 broke out, it found all over France no fewer than a thousand Brothers conducting 120 schools.

As to the pedagogical method followed, a little book, *L'École paroissiale*, which was in use during the seventeenth

century, lays down the method of instruction in reading, writing, orthography, arithmetic ; and also, if the boys were promising, in the elements of Latin. Such a programme, with a good method of teaching, is ample for elementary instruction ; the more so, when we remember that printed programmes, after the modern fashion, do not prove any advancement in either method or solidity, or the real extent of teaching. An excellent method with oral teaching prominent, and less of text-books learnt off slavishly by heart, make much better scholars than a multitude of text-books, a crowd of branches, and cheap programmes. Twenty-odd official programmes in a hundred years, upsetting colleges, schools, courses, twenty-odd times in a century, prove to demonstration that programmes do not cost much, and the newest conceit proves also that the last programme was not worth much, scarcely more than its successor is likely to be. The method approved by generations, a method truly national, as being experimental and traditional, perfected by the experience of men devoted like Bl. de la Salle, and yielding the fruits as well of sound piety as of competency for the duties of life, is the exclusive means by which a national system of education can be worked. It is of the Church, and under the Church ; it is from the people and in the people ; and it is conducted by the natural guardians, friends and benefactors of the faithful of Christ—the clergy, the religious orders, and the pious laity.

We have spoken, in the most summary way, of a vast system of popular instruction, to which not the slightest allusion is made in pedagogical histories as commonly written. We have scarcely referred to the elementary education of girls ; though in France there were ordinarily two schools of charity in each parish, one for each sex. We have omitted entirely the great system of higher collegiate and university education. And we have taken our illustrations, for want of space, chiefly from one country.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On this subject of primary education in France, the researches of M. le chanoine Ernest Allain, in different volumes of the *Revue des Questions Historiques* are replete with information.

Let us close with observations drawn from the same quarter. The harangues of the revolutionists in the Convention, and in the Council of Five Hundred, the reports of Chaptal, member of the Council of State to Napoleon, are overwhelming in their testimony, however spitefully rendered, that education had been universal, that it had been excellent, and that the "clerical," or, as it was then called, the "fanatical" system of the Christian schools, alone won and retained the confidence of parents. The revolution had upset everything; and to-day, a century later, it has not succeeded, either in France or elsewhere, in founding anything that is excellent or permanent. It is dragging in its trail a universal decadence, literary as well as moral. It has no interest in education, except as spying therein a splendid political machine, or a ready way to affluence by means of the public funds. Its most advanced liberal minds are not more liberal than M. La Chalotais, whose reports to the French Parliament against the Jesuits have formed a kind of text to the infidel world. This liberal philosopher, having helped to clear the ground of the Society of Jesus, drew up a plan of studies on his own account for the conduct of a new "national" education: *Essai d'Education Nationale, 1763*. He expressed his indignation that "every body now wanted to study," and that the "Frères Ignorantins," successors and rivals of the Jesuits, "coming on the ground to destroy everything, teach reading and writing to people who ought to learn nothing else but how to fashion and mend quills for others." Then he formulated this principle: "The good of society demands that the knowledge of the people do not extend beyond their occupations. For common folk it is hardly necessary to know how to read and write, except for such as live by these arts, or whom these arts help to live." These sentiments, still in proof, La Chalotais submitted to Voltaire. And the latter replied: "I cannot thank you too much, monsieur, for having given me a foretaste of what you destine for France. . . . I find your views useful. I thank you for proscribing study among the laboring classes. I who cultivate a farm beg to tender you a request, that you will obtain for

me hand-laborers, and not tonsured clerks. Above all, send me *Frères Ignorantins* to drive my ploughs and to mend them.”\*

THOMAS HUGHES, S.J.

*St. Louis University,  
St. Louis, Mo.*

---

### THE RUBRICS OF THE MASS.

He that contemneth small things shall fall by little and little.—*Ecclesiasticus*.

A contemptu nescio quomodo excusari possint istas (missae) caeremonias omittentes saepe saepius, imo immutantes, transferentes et confundentes.—*Turrino*.

Inasmuch as the action which you are about to perform is one of no small peril, I advise you, my dear sons, before celebrating Mass, to learn carefully from well-instructed priests the order of the whole Mass and everything relating to the Consecration, Breaking and Communion of the Sacred Host.—*Rite of Ordination*.

WHEN the elder clergy of X— get together and begin exchanging reminiscences, one name that is sure to figure prominently in the conversation is that of Bishop M., the saintly and scholarly Ordinary who ruled their diocese during the fifth and sixth decades of the present century. Ever zealous for God’s honor and glory, and somewhat punctilious as to the order and decency of all religious functions, this prelate had especially at heart the exact observance by his clergy of the rites and ceremonies of the Holy Sacrifice. In pastoral letters and synodal conferences he frequently insisted upon the necessity of a priest’s reviewing from time to time both the rubrics of the Missal and the decrees of the Sacred Congregation relating thereto; and, if local tradition does not belie him, he once enforced the same lesson in a manner as drastic as it was novel.

The incident, still spoken of as the “rubrical dinner,” is said to have occurred on the occasion of a popular pastor’s silver jubilee. Bishop M. and about a dozen of his priests

\* Quoted by E. Allain, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1875, T. I, p. 133.

arrived in the jubilarian's parish on the eve of the celebration; and the next morning low Masses were going on at Father B.'s three altars from six until eight o'clock. That the Bishop should hear one Mass preparatory to saying his own, and another by way of thanksgiving, was a matter of course; but his remaining in the sanctuary during still a third Mass was commented on as an additional instance of his ever-increasing piety. In the meanwhile, whether by accident or design, the Bishop's *prie-dieu* and chair were so placed in the sanctuary as to afford him an excellent view of all three altars; and a close observer might have noticed that the prelate's attention seemed to be pretty equally divided, his eyes following the movements, now of one celebrant, now of another, until the conclusion of the last low Mass. The Bishop displayed his usual affability at the breakfast-table; assisted at the throne during the Solemn Mass celebrated by the jubilarian; and preached a strong sermon in the course of which he paid a warm tribute to the worth and works of the exemplary pastor whose festival they were met to honor. Mass being concluded, and Father B. having made suitable replies to the congratulatory addresses presented by his parishioners and his brother clerics, bishop and priests spent an hour or so in pleasant converse before they were summoned to dinner.

Once in the dining-room, Bishop M. suddenly appeared in an extraordinary *rôle* which furnished the guests with a series of surprises from the soup to the walnuts, and led not a few of them to suspect that their Ordinary was afflicted with an attack of temporary insanity. For the time being, he seemed to have forgotten even the elemental rules of table etiquette, violating all the canons of polite living as recklessly and systematically as the most vulgar of half-famished street Arabs at a Thanksgiving festival.

Having adjusted his napkin around his neck after the manner of a baby's bib or a barber's towel, he drank his soup with audible gulps, smacking his lips as he swallowed the last drop of the liquid which he had tilted his plate to scoop up; took a leg of roast turkey in his fingers, and ate

the dressing with his knife ; reached over his neighbor's plate to help himself to dishes a little removed from him ; drank his coffee from the saucer with both elbows resting on the table ; and, having satisfied an apparently ravenous appetite before the other guests had nearly finished their meal, pushed back his chair, threw one leg over the other, and began ostentatiously to pick his teeth with his penknife. This astounding performance was not of course calculated to promote geniality, and although some of the priests, ignoring the eccentric behaviour of the Bishop, endeavored to keep the conversational ball rolling, it was manifestly uphill work. To several remarks addressed to him at the beginning of the dinner, Bishop M. paid no attention whatever, although he once or twice broke into an uproarious laugh at some very mild witticisms from guests at the other end of the table. To an inquiry from Father B. whether he was feeling quite well, he laconically replied "Tiptop" ; and then relapsed into silence until the end of the repast. The end came somewhat sooner than in ordinary circumstances would have been the case. Short work was made of the concluding courses, and the host was about to give the signal for rising, when the Bishop shutting his penknife and drawing closer to the table, raised his hand and in his usual courteous manner, said, "Just a moment, Father B." Then turning to the expectant guests, he continued :

"It goes without saying, gentlemen, that the singularity of my conduct during the past half-hour has filled you with surprise, not to say consternation ; and I owe it to you all, and more particularly to our host, to offer some explanation of that conduct. In one word, then, I have been endeavoring to give you an object-lesson in rubrics, or rather, in the neglect of them. You may have noticed that I was present this morning while nine among you celebrated low Mass ; but you did not perhaps remark that I paid particular attention as to *how* you celebrated. In disregarding, as I have done during this dinner, all rules of etiquette, I have merely tried to reproduce the neglect which some of you habitually show to the rubrics of the Missal ; and the boorish vulgarity

with which I have ignored social observances has assuredly not caused you such disgust and pain as the mutilated rites and ceremonies of this morning caused me. The rules of table etiquette which I have transgressed are, after all, purely directive, or even if they be considered preceptive, certainly do not oblige either *sub gravi* or *levi*. With the rubrics of the Mass, you do not need to be told, the case is far otherwise. I have merely to add, gentlemen, that I apologize very sincerely to Father B. for having marred the pleasantness of his dinner, and I trust that some of your number will apologize just as sincerely to Almighty God for your irreverence, precipitation and neglect of rubrics in the celebration of the adorable sacrifice."

Even were the whole story apocryphal, one might well say, "se non è vero, è ben trovato"; for nothing is surer than that just such a lesson would prove very beneficial to many ecclesiastics by impressing upon their minds a realization of the multiplied faults of which they are guilty in celebrating Mass. In a certain Canadian diocese, some years ago, there was prevalent among the confessors of priestly penitents, a practice which experience proved rather commendable, that of giving as an occasional "penance" the attentive reading of the rubrics of low Mass. The average priest who performed this satisfaction for the first time was thoroughly convinced of its *raison d'être*, and a notable improvement in the observance of the rubrics was the natural result.

Not to trench at all upon the vexed question as to whether a number of the minor rubrics of the Missal are preceptive or directive, one may surely deplore the inattention often paid to them, without meriting the reproach of finical niceness implied in the epithet "rubric fiend." At the very least, even the most purely directive of these rules of the Missal embody the worthiest and most reverent method of offering a sacrifice that is incomparably the greatest action performable on earth—a sacrifice so sublime that its most inconsiderate minister can scarcely believe anything pertaining to it to be a matter of trifling moment. Of the Mass may be said, in a truer sense than ever Emerson dreamt of,



“There is no great and no small  
To the Soul that knoweth all ;”

and a priest may well feel that the least obligatory of the directions laid down for its celebration merits more of his attentive heed than do most other actions of his day.

It is not the directive rubrics only, however, that are violated with lamentable frequency by priests who either have never learned how to say Mass properly, or have neglected to correct, by occasionally reviewing the rubrics, the faults into which they have been betrayed by forgetfulness, inadvertence and routinism. In a valuable supplement to his *Cérémonial Romain*, Falise treats of the faults ordinarily committed in the celebration of Mass, and of the no fewer than fifty-three he instances, many are transgressions against rubrics which are very certainly preceptive. That some clerics profess to attribute no importance whatever to various details of the ceremonies of the Holy Sacrifice (details which they themselves habitually neglect) is explicable only on the presumption that with them “the wish is father to the thought” ; and they seem quite oblivious of the fact that their inconsistency is made glaringly manifest by the weight which they give to the other details not a particle more authoritatively prescribed. In this matter of rubrics, indeed, priests not infrequently

“Compound with sins they are inclined to  
By damning those they have not mind to,”

as if their vigorous condemnation of the lapses made by others were a species of compensation for the faults of which they themselves are guilty. Like Bishop Warburton’s witty distinction, “Orthodoxy is my doxy ; heterodoxy is another man’s doxy,” the difference, in the estimation of many a priest, between the two kinds of rubrics seems to be, “Preceptive rubrics are those I observe ; directive ones are those I neglect.”

Of the genuine importance of *all* the rubrics of the Missal, it is easy to form a correct estimate by weighing well the terms of this extract from the bull prefixed to the Missal of

Pius V: "Mandantes et districte omnibus et singulis . . . in virtute sanctae obedientiae praecipientes, ut . . . Missam juxta ritum, modum ac normam quae per Missale hoc a Nobis nunc traditur, decantant ac legant, neque in Missae celebratione alias caeremonias vel preces, quam quae hoc Missali continentur, addere vel recitare praesumant." The intent of this paragraph is very clearly to make the observance of the rubrics of the Missal strictly obligatory; and where the very wording of the rubric itself does not obviously show a mere counsel, the non-existence of obligation can scarcely be presumed. The washing of the hands, for instance, and the preparation of the Missal in the sacristy, by disposing the "signacula" in their proper places, are both ordained under the general heading, *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missae*; and it is an inadequate justification of neglect of either act to state that one's hands are already clean, or that one always prepares the Mass before descending the altar steps to begin the psalm, *Judica me, Deus*. This going to the corner of the altar, opening the Missal, and verifying the proper arrangement of the "signacula" before descending to begin the psalm, is merely the accomplishment of another and a separate rubric; and does not at all obviate the necessity of conforming to that which prescribes the previous finding of the Mass in the sacristy.

The ordinary priest who has not from time to time renewed his study of the rubrics, would probably be more than surprised to hear of the number of points in which his practise differs from the ordained "ritum, modum ac normam" of saying Mass, the positive faults of which he is habitually guilty, the distorted and mutilated ceremonies to which he has accustomed himself, but for which he can cite the authority of no rubricist great or little, ancient or modern. Fortunate for him if he has a brother priest candid enough to call his attention to his numerous lapses—and skillful enough to do so without wounding his self-esteem. Better still if, seeing the necessity for reform in his method of celebrating the adorable sacrifice, he has the good sense to recommence the study of the Mass from *De Praeparatione*

*Sacerdotis Celebraturi*, thoroughly learning a little daily until he knows and observes the most minute rubric.

The Ordinary of a diocese, according to a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, cannot escape responsibility for the neglect or violation of rubrics among the clergy under his jurisdiction. "Ordinarius stricte tenetur opportunis remediis providere, ut Rubricae et S. R. C. Decreta rite serventur; siquid dubii occurat, recurrendum ad S. C. pro declaratione." Few Ordinaries, presumably, would consider such a course of action as Bishop M.'s rubrical dinner an opportune remedy for abuses however great; but some have instituted practices more available and not less effective. One such practice is the "rehearsal" or "moot" Mass at the regular ecclesiastical retreat, or at one of the several conferences held in the course of the year. In the presence of all the clergy, assembled in the sacristy or other convenient apartment where the Blessed Sacrament is not kept, one of the younger priests vests, and goes through all the ceremonies of the Mass. His every movement, position and action is critically noted by the on-lookers, and objection is promptly taken to whatever may appear to any one of their number a deviation from the order prescribed by the rubrics or the ceremonial recognized as authoritative in the diocese. When such objection is raised the celebrant proceeds no further until the point has been thoroughly discussed and finally decided by reference to the authorities mentioned. The exercise, if seriously conducted, may occupy an hour and a half or two hours; but it is time exceedingly well spent, and few, if any, of the participants fail to "learn something new" from the practice.

It clearly does not enter into the scope of such a paper as this to mention a moiety of the faults which rubricists note as commonly occurring in the celebration of the Mass; but as more interest attaches to the particular and concrete than to the general and abstract, it may be permissible to specify just a few points about which the reader may readily discover defects of his own, or, at least, of some of his clerical acquaintances. And first, the inclination of the body, to be

made during the *Confiteor*, as also at the *Munda cor meum*, the *Te igitur* and the *Supplices te rogamus*, should be profound; that is, the body should be bent far enough to allow the knees to be touched by the hands. Unless a good many priests have abnormally long arms, their inclinations are less profound than moderate. The custom of bending either the body or the head while making the genuflexion (*unico genu*) is not only ungraceful but incorrect, even at or after the Consecration. The minor reverence is included in the greater, the inclination in the genuflexion, which, as Wapelhorst and other liturgists teach, "semper fit absque capitis vel corporis inclinatione." The devotional sentiment which probably inspires the act may well give way to a desire exactly to conform to the rubrics. The sign of the cross should be made in straight lines, not in arcs of circles or in parabolic curves; and to substitute for it a scooping of the air with the hand, or, still worse, a mere gyratory movement of the fingers, is to travesty one of the most venerable of ceremonies. The *Orate fratres*, the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* and the *Domine non sum dignus* ought to be, but commonly are not, said in a lower tone of voice than the other portions of the Mass, which are said aloud. The hands, when extended, should be not farther apart or nearer together than the width of the shoulders; when elevated, they should not be raised higher than the shoulders; and in both positions they should be so held that the palms shall face each other.

Attentive consideration of the foregoing points, and of dozens of similar ones to be found in any good Ceremonial, can scarcely fail to benefit the ecclesiastic. The transcendent sublimity of the Holy Sacrifice would demand such consideration, even were the rubrics optional instead of compulsory. It is attention to details that ensures the beauty and harmony of any ceremony: and no priest can celebrate Mass with congruous impressiveness unless he accurately observes "the little things" of the rubrics.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C.

*St. Joseph's College, St. Joseph, N. B., Canada.*

## CLERICAL STUDIES.

## TWENTIETH ARTICLE.

## MORAL THEOLOGY.—(V.)—ITS LIMITATIONS.

ONE of the most striking differences between the moral teachings of the Catholic Church and those of Protestantism or philosophy is found in the fulness and assurance of the former as compared with the habitual vagueness and hesitancy of the latter. The guidance of the Catholic Church is preeminently practical; it covers the whole ground of human conduct, and traces out a course easy to most, accessible to all, yet offering perfect security to those who follow it. At first sight nothing seems wanting to its completeness; but a closer examination reveals the fact that it remains unfinished on every side; that in each one of its aspects, much remains which still may be discovered, much also which of its nature is hidden from human knowledge, to be seen only when the veil is withdrawn and the narrow present vanishes into the boundless future. To consider the limits within which, as a necessity or as a fact, moral theology is thus confined, will, it seems to us, be a considerable help to a proper understanding of the science.

Moral theology embraces in theory the whole field of human action and has for its object to determine the existence, the extent, the gravity, the underlying principles of all human obligations, and of the responsibilities consequent on them. We have to see how far this object has been or may be effected, and in what it necessarily falls short.

## I.

As regards the question of their existence.

(1) There are primordial duties which have been held as indubitable at all times by all races of men. Such are the duties of justice, benevolence, gratitude, religious reverence, a certain restraint of the lower appetites, and the like. They are always taken for granted, appealed to as self-evident and never demonstrated because of their very evidence.

(2) The number of these unquestioned obligations has been increasing in the course of ages, under the influence of divinely revealed truth, or as the outcome of progressive civilization. The Jewish code of morals was far in advance of that of the pagans; the Christian law corrected and completed in many particulars that of the Jews. Stoicism awakened the Roman empire to the consciousness of many duties unheeded in earlier times. A steady growth of ascertained moral truths is noticeable even in the Church, the law of development having its application fully as much and for the same reasons in moral as in dogmatic theology. In many cases where the Fathers hesitated, we to-day are certain. To determine moral duty they turned mainly to Scripture. "What Scripture forbids we may not do," says S. Basil (Regul. brevior. I), "and what it commands we should not fail to accomplish. But as regards those things on which it is silent, we have the rule of the Apostle: *All things are lawful for me, but all do not edify.*" The difficulty was to gather anything like a definite rule either from the Old Testament, amid maxims and examples often perplexing, to say the least, and remote from the spirit of the Gospel; or from the Gospel itself, admirably clear as a direction and an impulse, but vague and indefinite as an obligatory law. It was reserved to the schoolmen to work out the problem systematically and in all its details, with the result of gifting us at the present day with a more definite and better ascertained rule of life than the world possessed at any previous period.

(3) Yet the work is far from having reached its end. Our books of moral theology are still full of varying conceptions of duty. True, there is a happy tendency to agreement on many points long controverted. But agreement on such matters, recent or ancient, does not necessarily imply the final settlement of them. All know the varying fortunes of certain opinions; how some spring up suddenly into life and rapidly win favor; how others, long universally believed in, gradually lose their hold on men's minds and finally disappear. Thus, to confine ourselves to a few more obvious

instances, it was the disposition of the Fathers to erect into positive commands some of the evangelical counsels in regard to such subjects as chastity, matrimony, worldly pursuits, alms-giving, forbearance under injury, self-defence and the like. But what was extreme in their views gradually gave way to a more correct estimate of human nature, still weak even when regenerated. In the opposite direction several objectionable practices, such as judiciary combats and duelling, introduced by the barbarians, were long tolerated, invested even with religious sanctions in many places, and yielded but slowly to the prohibitions of the Church. Theologians themselves clung for many centuries to the ancient tradition forbidding "usury," understood as the practice of making money by lending money. They were long unanimous in maintaining the so-called "principle of equality" in contracts to which modern society has substituted the much more intelligible principle of mutual freedom.

Again, oaths were long considered as binding even when extorted by fraud or by fear, if only they could be kept without sin. Paternal authority was upheld by the earlier theologians to an extent and with consequences to which nobody could give countenance at the present day. Slavery was as universally and as readily admitted in past times as it is condemned in ours. Changes of a similar kind might be pointed out in various other directions, all going to show the fluctuating and uncertain character of moral rules long unanimously acquiesced in, and suggesting the possibility of more than one point, upon which there is present agreement, being re-opened and discussed afresh, just as is happening to-day in regard to so many social and scientific problems. Happily the reflex principals which play so important a part in human conduct are ever at hand to direct our course or to reassure us despite our speculative uncertainties.

## II.

The existence of each duty once ascertained, a second question naturally arises: How far does it extend? to what exactly does it bind us?

Here again we have the same combination of certainties and uncertainties. In the case of negative duties: "thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal," etc., the general law is clear enough, as also in the case of positive duties, when they are of a definite kind, such as paying one's debts, obedience to parents, and the like. But almost all such laws are subject to limitations, some again evident, but many others determined only with much difficulty, and leaving to the end a considerable margin of vagueness and uncertainty. Thus, for example, we are bound to pay our debts, but only when physically and morally able to do so. Physical impossibilities are easily ascertained; moral possibilities and impossibilities, on the contrary, as all theologians know, are extremely difficult to determine with any precision. Again, we are bound to avoid causing injury to others. Yet directly or indirectly, remotely or proximately, we are doing it, in some measure, or sharing in it, almost every day without scruple, doubtless because we consider that there is a sufficient reason for our doing so. But when is the reason sufficient?

The character of indefiniteness is still more sensible in certain positive duties. Who, for instance, can tell the man of wealth just what he is bound to do for the needy hundreds who appeal to him, or for the thousands whom he knows to be in deep distress? The sinner is subject to the natural and divine law of atonement, but strictly obliged to what? The Christian acknowledges the obligation of prayer. Christ tells us to pray always. When is the precept fulfilled in its integrity? Again He describes the giving of scandal as a terrible evil, and the misfortune of being exposed to it as a thing to avoid at the cost of what is most necessary and most dear to us. How are we to interpret all this practically?

Questions of this kind arise on all sides, especially in connection with duties of a general nature, forming, as it were, a deep fringe of penumbra around the central light of clearly defined obligations. To narrow this shadow more and more is the constant effort of moral theology, indeed, we may say of the human conscience, and, considering the imperfection



of the data, the results arrived at are truly remarkable. The individual man, were he compelled to face such problems alone, could only feel his inability to grapple with them. But he knows that he is not alone, and as soon as perplexity arises as to the extent of any one of his duties, he instinctively looks around him to see how it is measured by his fellow-men, especially by those who are deemed upright and good, and he feels safe provided he does just as they do.

If he is a Catholic, he looks to the Church or to his confessor speaking in her name, considering that it is part of their mission to warn him if he unconsciously fails in the performance of any important duty. The Church in turn and the confessor gather light from what is found and from what is absent from the traditions, the laws, the accepted customs of Christian ages, from the teachings of the Fathers and the mind of the Saints, more likely, because of their nearness to God, to know the full extent of His will.

But, underlying it all:—behind the appreciations of the Saints, of the Fathers, of theologians, confessors and the public at large, there is a certain fundamental conception or philosophy of human life, individual and collective, of its practical possibilities and of its ultimate purposes, upon which all is unconsciously yet really built. To put it in a few words, the supreme law of man is that of the homage of his whole being to God. The will of God—necessary as regards what is due to Himself—free in all else—is the complete rule of human action. What God means man to do and to be, that and that alone is his duty. Now, without entering into particulars, the object of the Divine will would seem to be substantially *the conservation and progress of the individual and of society*. All man's moral impulses lead in that direction and converge toward that end. It is the standard to which we instinctively compare human actions and declare them good or evil. Whatever perfects man singly or collectively we believe to be pleasing to God; whatever weakens or lessens him, especially in the moral order which is felt to be supreme, we unhesitatingly declare to be wrong.

Besides this general direction, there are certain other more

special lines of development along which man is led by his moral sense, and which are determined by the peculiar manner in which he is made. For man is not merely a rational being in general; he is a rational and moral being of a definite kind, offering a combination of special elements, sensations, emotions, thoughts, fancies, principles, etc., etc.,—acting and reacting under special laws and limitations. It is just these that give human duty not only its individual character but also its true limits. And this is why that unconscious philosophy to which we refer, built on an obscure yet real and concrete sense of things, feels itself able to determine the extent of obligations where abstract reason is unequal to the task. Where the philosopher hesitates because he sees only the general features of the case, the practical man intuitively grasps all the elements and reaches a decision.

In this way, then, much of the vagueness of duty has been removed. The process continues and is bound to continue, with the result of making man's obligations ever clearer and more definite. Yet something of indeterminateness clings to several of them fatally; and will remain to the end. Besides, the constant change of surroundings, adaptation to which is as much a law of the moral as of the physical life, will ever continue to raise new doubts according as the older ones are dispelled, thus leaving the science incomplete in this as in its other aspects.

### III.

A full knowledge of our duties would imply not only our recognizing clearly their existence, and seeing distinctly how far they extend, but also the possibility of our determining accurately their degree of urgency. For each one of them has its definite measure of importance: each fault has its exact degree of guilt. Between the slightest obligation and the weightiest; between the faintest beginnings of evil and its lowest depths, there are degrees without number. It is with them as with colors, few in their original simplicity,

yet so varied in nature that art is powerless to reproduce them with perfect accuracy. In the Gobelins tapestry-works each color reckons tones by the hundred, from the darkest to the brightest, passing from one to the other so imperceptibly that only the trained eye of the artist can detect a difference between those which follow in close succession; yet their fifteen thousand different dyes are found inadequate—a true picture of the countless shades of moral obligation and of the moral evil consequent on its violation.

Theology can offer no means of measuring them. It easily recognizes, of course, some evils as greater than others; it has also its distinction of imperfections, venial and mortal sins. But such a classification is at most a rough and rudimentary one, much like that of dividing all men into the good and the wicked, or the rich and the poor. It includes under the same denomination cases extremely unlike one another, an act of deep deliberate villainy and a transient weakness being both called mortal sins, though a single case of the former may be worse than a hundred of the latter.

The theological distinction itself is not devoid of difficulty. If imperfection is displeasing to God, as implying a voluntary departure from His will, it is not easy to see how it is not sinful; nor is it easier to understand how the worst of venial and the lightest of mortal sins, with scarce a shadow of perceptible difference between them, should nevertheless be separated, in themselves and in their consequences, by an almost incalculable distance.

But accepting it such as it is, its application is often one of extreme difficulty. Thus, we know that the worst passions are only the abnormal development of what are originally blameless impulses. When do they become simply objectionable, when positively sinful, when grievously so? Waste of time is reprehensible; when is it properly a sin? What amount of money may a man squander in the indulgence of his fancies or his follies, without incurring a grave responsibility? We object to the habit of betting or gambling, yet very few scruple to indulge in a solitary act of either, and who can say just when the gambler may be stopped in his

course by the threat of eternal perdition? To injure a man in his possessions is wrong ; but when is it a grievous wrong? How much does it take to constitute a mortal sin? Here is a case of every day occurrence, and theologians in trying to solve it tell us many true and helpful things. They remark that it takes more when one has only shared in the injustice than if he alone were to cause it ; that much depends on the position of the injured party, on the view he is likely to take, or should if reasonable take, of the harm done him ; on the way the wrong was done—stealthily or violently, deliberately or by carelessness or neglect ; on the very title by which he held that of which he has been deprived ; for although the civil law places all cases of ownership on the same level, natural right admits many shades of difference between them. But all this helps more to show the complexity of the problem than to solve it, and in the end our theologians themselves can only form conjectures.

Much more perhaps is conjectural in such distinctions (between mortal and venial) than is generally thought. There are, of course, crimes which all civilized nations have looked upon with horror ; there are practices which, if viewed leniently, would soon prove subversive of the providential order to which we visibly belong ; there are deeds so frequently and so strongly denounced in Holy Writ that we have to consider them as capable of separating the soul from God, even though their intrinsic evil may not be apparent to us. But even here exaggeration is possible, still more in the region of positive law, where the fear of hell has been made to play more, perhaps, than its due part in order to secure a more prompt and more thorough obedience.

However that may be, it is always a grave and solemn act to trace a line of separation leading to such terrible issues. The Fathers were slow to do it. They confined themselves to what was most obvious, as do those good people of the present day whose sole concern is to know the will of God and to accomplish it. To ascertain just how far they may be unfaithful without incurring eternal damnation, has nothing more practical in it for them than for a dutiful son to consider

what faults would lead to his expulsion from his father's home. The distinction is serviceable only to coarse, weak or ungenerous souls, or to the priests who strive to preserve them or to rescue them from what is worst. It is to help the latter, principally, in the ministry of the confessional, that theologians have carried their distinction of what is mortal and venial into every branch of human duty. Their rulings are naturally of unequal and varying value, a fact which perplexed confessors are sometimes glad to remember, and which might induce them, in turn (besides other reasons), to dwell less on such sharp divisions than some do in their instructions to the faithful.

#### IV.

But even though it were possible to trace a distinct, clear-cut line of division between mortal and venial sin in every sphere of duty, it could after all respond only to the objective side of the question. Yet the subjective side is, in all its particulars, a no less essential element. Indeed the moral value of human action is principally determined by the mental and moral condition of the agent, and that condition can be ascertained only in a very imperfect way.

Here lies what may be considered perhaps the principal weakness of moral science; its inability to measure with anything like accuracy the moral value, positive or negative, of individual actions.

The positive value of an action, as all know, is in the motive. But what gives its moral value to the motive? Three things: its elevation, its purity and its intensity. As regards the first, even in the order of virtues, there are motives higher than others, and it may not be difficult to establish the hierarchical position of each, or to ascertain its presence and moving power in a given action. But to measure its purity is out of the question. Motives scarce ever act alone. In our most generous deeds there is always something of self; and as for our daily life, we are borne along by countless impulses, good, bad, and indifferent, of whose presence we are for the most part very imperfectly conscious,

and whose real power and relative share in our actions are to us a still greater mystery. As regards the intensity of the virtuous motive considered in itself, it cannot be measured at all, if for no other reason because there is no standard to measure it by.

Still less can we attempt to determine the measure of moral evil. The man who sins is guilty in proportion to his general moral enlightenment; to the special knowledge he has of the evil contained in or consequent on his action; to his advertence or present consciousness of the same; in proportion also to the freedom of his action, which in turn is determined by his antecedent habits, by the actual power of his evil impulses, by his natural strength of will and consequent ability to resist them, by the amount of help which comes to him from without, that is, from his surroundings or from the grace of God. Now what is all this but a series of varying quantities, of which we cannot expect ever to reach even the approximate value?

All human responsibility is limited. It varies from one to another, and in the same individual it varies with times, conditions and objects. The case, in particular, of a man who sins with his eyes open is clear enough in one respect. But how judge that of the man who does wrong through ignorance? It is easy speculatively to draw a distinction between vincible and invincible ignorance; but there are numberless degrees in both, and it is almost impossible to say where they meet in the concrete. Between two men who do evil, one consciously and the other through ignorance or inadvertence, there seems to be the widest difference; and yet the guilt of the latter may be very great, though he never at any time fully opened his eyes to the fact that he was unfaithful to duty. Similar responsibilities arising from thoughtlessness, neglect, or the unconscious or vaguely conscious working of unworthy inclinations in the soul form one of the deepest and most unfathomable mysteries of the moral life. The very freedom of the will is in all its aspects one of the greatest of mysteries. All attempts to analyze or explain, seem only to destroy it, and if the world continues

to believe in it still, it is in spite of argument and as an intuitive indestructible condition of the human mind. But the more we watch its action, the more we are convinced of its manifold practical limitations, making man less, on the whole, of a free agent than he gives himself credit for.

The consequence of all this is that we can know but very imperfectly the real moral value of other men, and that even of our own worth we never can be sure. On the subjective still more than on the objective side of morals our knowledge is variously limited, some things being seen distinctly, others vaguely, while many are hidden out of sight and, it may be, beyond our reach. Such being our natural condition, as Aristotle observes, just in this connection (*Moral. I, 3*), "it is the part of an educated man to require exactness in each class of subjects only as far as the nature of the subject admits." If, after all, moral science has succeeded in ascertaining the chief component elements of the moral world and its principal laws, has it not done as much for it as physics and chemistry have done for the physical universe? Both worlds offer an endless variety and complexity of forms, combinations ever new of their primordial elements, now hiding, now revealing their secrets, and equally attractive in what they tell and in what they conceal. And as in natural, so in moral science there is constant growth. Through a deeper and more accurate knowledge of the soul, of human nature, of life, the older problems are coming to be more accurately solved, while new questions and new views are ever widening the moral horizon. On the other hand, by the steady expansion of the political, juridical and social sciences, moral theology is ever stirred up to fresh efforts, and thus a new life flows in, as it were, upon it from all sides and perennial youth is unceasingly brought back to the most ancient form of human knowledge.

J. HOGAN.

## THE NAME OF JOHN IN HAGIOGRAPHY.

THERE is probably no other English name so popular as that of John. The same may be said of its equivalents in other tongues, Johann, Jean, Juan, Jan, João, Giovanni, Ivan, Efan, with such varieties as Jones and Hans, all of which trace their origin to the Hebrew *Jehochanan* (Yohanan). It has, like most of the Jewish proper names, a religious signification, and literally means *God has been kind*. The Greek translators of the Old Testament were not consistent in their rendering of this name from the ancient text, sometimes reading *Johanan* Ἰωανάν (I Par. iii, 15), again *Jona* Ἰωνά (IV Kings, xxv, 23), or Ἰωνάθαν (I Par. xxvi, 3), and Ἰωανῆς (II Par. xviii, 12). In the later books of the Old Law the reading *Joannes* Ἰωάννης is usually observed which is also adopted in the Latin Vulgate. There are at least sixteen persons of this name who figure in the sacred history of the Hebrews (in Paral., Kings, Esdras and the Macchabees), although in some cases it is not clear whether those mentioned by different writers are not identical.<sup>1</sup>

But it is as a Christian name that the Hebrew expression "through grace of God" has become a universal shibboleth attesting the sense of gratitude for the bestowal of the Christian religion first announced and sealed with the martyr's blood by the Precursor.

St. John the Baptist before his birth had caught the blessed influence of the Messiah's presence and communicated it to Elizabeth in the joy she felt at the salutation of Mary. And sweetly has the echo of another voice, that of St. John the Beloved, carried the joy of the Saviour's Gospel to the ends of the earth. Surely in these two shadows of the Master's figure, one before, the other after the noon-day of the Redemption, "Jehovah has been gracious."

If the name is common among Christians, we need not be surprised to find that of all others in the history of the Catholic Church it is the one that suggests the ripest fruit of Christian sanctity. The number of persons who, under

1 Ex. gr. II. Mac., xi, 17.



this name, have been placed on the calendar of the saints, or who are mentioned as canonized, beatified or venerated in different churches and religious orders, amounts to upwards of a thousand. From the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, the hagiography of the Abbé Migne, the various authenticated *Menologies* we gather the history in detail of about one hundred and eighty *canonized* saints; nearly one hundred more bear the appellation of *Beatus*; the remainder are called *Venerabilis*, which means that their claim to the process of beatification and canonization has been recognized by the Church, and a large number belong to the host of confessors of the faith whose title to the honor of heroic sanctity is established either by the fact of martyrdom or by an immemorial tradition such as gives stability to a cult that cannot be placed to any mere credulity or superstition. Stadler, in his *Heiligen-Lexicon*, mentions under the name of *Johannes* no less than nine hundred and ninety-four persons of whom he found some account in the various authenticated calendars of saints, and at the end, referring to the *Menologium* of the Franciscan Order, composed by Hueber, adds: "This menology contains accounts of more than a hundred other holy Franciscans who had the name of John, but we selected only such as are found in the Bollandists."

It may be asked: Is there anything peculiar in the character of these saints which shows the impress of the model whose name they bear? That this should be the case cannot surprise us when we remember that the Christian name usually given in baptism is intended to point out the patron whom the young Christian is to regard as his protector and model of life. It is of the very essence of Christian asceticism—which may be summed up in the words: Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect—that it should aim at imitating some pattern of heroic holiness; Christ in the first place, but not excluding His heroic followers, men found in similar conditions of life with ourselves and lacking the halo of the divinity.

The two great heroes who first appear in Christian history bearing the name of John, became, of course, the principal

patrons of the valiant host that followed in the train of the "Lamb." The devotion of the Christian people to the two holy contemporaries of our Lord flows in twin streams of enthusiastic attachment along the ages, now swelling the train of the Baptist, now that of the Beloved Disciple in ever fervid progress. Christian art, especially of the Middle Ages, loves to introduce the Baptist into the symbolic composition of its master-paintings, because he was regarded as the model of the monastic life, which, having lost for a time the ardor of the early Benedictines, began to flourish anew with the movement which had urged on the Crusades. Moreover, St. John was commonly chosen by the guilds as the special patron of the arts, so that a devotion to him naturally inspired the monumental works of painting, sculpture and architecture which were raised to the honor of the Most High.

The Virgin Disciple of Christ, St. John the Evangelist, had made his first acquaintance with the Master, whom he so ardently loved, through St. John the Baptist. They had stood at the well in Bethania when Jesus walked by. Then the Precursor pointed Him out, saying: "Behold the Lamb of God." And John and Andrew followed Jesus. (St. John i, 35-37). Apart from the sweet attachment to our divine Lord and His holy Mother, we may regard St. John as in a special sense the teacher and trainer of the episcopate. His Gospel, as all his writings, differs from the synoptic Gospels in this, that its doctrine enters more closely into the divine relations of Christ and His Church. On this account he has been called "Theologian," and the Greek Church still honors him under the title of *θεολογος*. When, after the death of our blessed Lady, he left Jerusalem to assume the direction of the metropolitan See of Ephesus (Iren. Adv. Haeres, iii, 1), he devoted his attention to the education in the sacred office of the episcopate of such holy men as Papias of Hieropolis, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp of Smyrna, and others. Banished to Patmos, he is shown in a vision the future of the Church, and under the impulse of the Holy Ghost, full of solicitude for the episcopate, he is moved to

write to the bishops of the seven churches. What consoling words of infallible assurance are those addressed to the poor persecuted Bishop of Smyrna and to him of Philadelphia "who had kept the word of patience!" What awful warning to the shepherd of Pergamus against whom—despite his firm faith in the Lord—he has this, that he has suffered in the midst of his flock, "them that hold the doctrine of Balaam," and are "a stumbling block before the children." So, too, he speaks to the Bishop Thyatira, whose works and faith and charity and ministry and patience he knows full well, yet against whom he charges, that he suffers a woman, Jezabel, "to seduce my servants." But there is only woe in the flaming words with which he denounces the lukewarm Bishop of Laodicea, whom, approved of before the world and blind to his own failings, he addresses as "wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked." This is the discipline of the meek Apostle whose doctrine, after he returned to Ephesus, to the end of his old age was summed up in the oft-repeated admonition: Little children love one another.

In the long catalogue of saints who follow these two models, the number of those who chose preferably to the life of activity in the world that of monastic retirement, and who in most cases shared the blessed prerogative of martyrdom, seems to be the greater. The remainder are nearly all bishops; one only canonized representative in the apostolic line of sovereign pontiffs.

The name of John is known and favored, as has been remarked, in every land of the earth; so also does the host of saints who have borne it include natives of all the regions of earth where Christian truth has found an echo.

One of the earliest anchorites, St. John "the Obedient," as he is called, comes to us from Æthiopia during the time of the Emperor Theodosius. His feast is celebrated in the Roman Martyrology on March 27.<sup>1</sup> Several others are cited under the title of "Æthiopian" and "Ægyptian." A number

<sup>1</sup> The Kopts celebrate his feast on October 17, which is supposed to have been the day of his death. *Migne* and others give St. Johannes Sijutensis, who is assumed to be identical with the above, on November 17.

of native Chinese martyrs, among whom we note the learned young priest John Dat (October 28, 1798), and the layman John Baptist Con (November 7) who suffered martyrdom in Tonking toward the end of 1840, contribute to swell the list of saints who bear the significant name of John. Japan, too, is not behind its Mongoloid sister-kingdom. For February 3 the Bollandists assign five Sts. John, among whom are three who died as martyrs in Nangasaki—St. Johannes Soan, S. J., a youth of nineteen and a native of Japan; St. Johannes Rimoia, a Japanese silk-weaver who belonged to the Third Order of St. Francis, and St. Johannes Franciscus, O.S.F., who was crucified with the other two in 1597, and canonized in 1862. In many cases the nationality of the saint is marked by the addition, to the baptismal name of an adjective indicating the birthplace, by which they are known to the Catholic world. Thus we have a Johannes *Cappadox* (February 21), a *Damascenus* (May 6), an *Hispanus* (June 25), *Germanus* (October 24), *Scotus* (November 3), a Scotch bishop and martyr of the eleventh century who is to be distinguished from the Blessed John *Scotus Malmesburiensis*, an Irishman (November 10), whose appellation *Erigena* is said to indicate his true birthplace, even if it were not known that the name *Scotus* and *Hibernicus*, or *Erin-gena*, are used indiscriminately to designate the same country. In England we have St. John of *York* (Beverlacensis), St. John of *Bridlington* (Branglanator?). Blessed John Fisher (Roffensis) might here be mentioned with the glorious band of martyrs recently beatified, who fell victims to the so-called Reformation under Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Among these the honored name of John is most conspicuous. Besides the Blessed Cardinal Fisher, we have the beatified martyrs John Houghton, John Rochester, John Davy (Carthusians); John Forest, O.S.F.; John Stone, O.S.A.; John Haile and John Larke (secular priests); John Nelson, John Payne, John Shert, likewise priests; John Story, Doctor of Law, and Blessed John Felton, also a layman.

In a similar way we might mention a hundred others, well known by the appellation of their origin or principal scene

of activity, such as *Johannes de Manntha*, *Nepomucenus*, *Parmensis*, *a Facundo*, *Coloniensis*, *Cassianus*, *Laudensis*, *Trevir*, *Capistranus*, *Venetus*, *Salernitanus*, *Ruysbrochius*, *Avila*, *Prandotha* (Poland), *Dukla* (Lithuania), etc.

With many the family name of the saint has prevailed in the Christian memory. The oldest example is probably St. John *Marcus*, mentioned in the Acts xii, 12; others are St. John Francis *Regis*, *Gualbertus*, *Sarcander* (Greek translation of *Fleischmann*), *Berchmanus*, *de Rossi*, *Perboyre*, etc.

There are not many saints John of the secular clergy, but among them are to be mentioned St. John (18 Aug.) the companion of St. Crispus of very early date (Emp. Diocletian,) and St. John of Kenty (Cantius) (20 Oct.) whose admirable lessons of life as professor in theology and likewise as parish priest make him a great favorite among the clergy, especially of his own country. His peaceful character and careful conduct are imaged in the words which he wrote on the wall of his room, and which recall to mind the similar motto found over the table in the chamber of St. Augustine:

Conturbare cave, non est placare suave;  
Diffamare cave, nam revocare grave.

Among the titles which distinguish the many saints of the name of John there are some that point to the peculiarity of their ascetical character, others to some remarkable supernatural gift or grace with which they were endowed, others again indicate the particular state or occupation in life, or the prevailing disposition of mind and heart, or even some physical condition by which they were known to their contemporaries. There is St. John the *Anchorite* (Anachoreta); the *Faster* (Jejunator); the *Almoner* (Eleemosynarius); the *Silent* (Silentiarius) whom Christian art represents as a bishop holding his finger upon his lips, (May 13); the *Humble*; the *Mendicant*; the *Ascetic* (March 16); there is another saint of the same name usually called the *Younger Ascetic* (Asceta junior) whose feast occurs on Febr. 5; *a Cruce*; *de Deo*; etc. Then there is the Blessed John, called the *Angelic* because of his lovely disposition (Jan. 13), St. John the *Lamb* (Agnus),

Bishop of Utrecht. Another, the Blessed Joannes Grande of the Benedictine order, persisted in calling himself the *Sinner* until people accepted the term and called the man whom they revered as a saint "Peccador," (July 3). St. John the *Good*; the *Golden-tongued* (Chrysostomos); the *Wonder-worker* (Thaumaturgos) are familiar to all. Less known, probably, are St. John the *Dwarf* (*Κολοβός*) one of the principal Fathers of the Desert classed among the saints in the Greek and Coptic churches;<sup>1</sup> St. John the *Soldier* (June 12); St. John the *Shepherd* (Opilio) whose feast is placed together with that of his holy patron, the Baptist, (June 24), because the day of his death is not certainly known. St. John, Count of Corsano, commonly known as the *Reaper* (Theristes) on account of a miracle wrought by his intercession whilst attending the harvest laborers, is assigned in the Martyrology to June 24; but the Bollandists give his life under Febr. 24. St. John of the *Nettle* takes his name from a place overgrown with the weed, wherein he took refuge from the world and afterwards built a hospice for pilgrims who came that way from Compostella, (June 2); St. John *in the Well* (in Puteo) derives his name from having dwelt in an abandoned old cistern. The learned profession is represented by such saints as John the *Scholastic* and another *Ex-Scholastic*, patriarch of Constantinople (Feb. 21) in which latter case the word *Scholasticus* is to be taken as equivalent to *causidicus* or *advocatus* signifying that the bishop had at one time been a lawyer and renounced that profession to defend the cause of Christ. The more pretentious name Theologus, first applied to St. John the Evangelist, seems to have been given to other saints of the same name. Blessed John the Parish-priest (Plebanus), a Venetian, is celebrated Aug. 9. Among the Russian saints there is one St. John Petschiuricus, *i. e.*, the Locker (Clausor) which seems however to have here the figurative sense of "recluse." St. John *Climacus* has his name from a book which he composed with the title of "Climax" intending it to be a "Ladder" or guide to Paradise. The

<sup>1</sup> His name is not found in the Roman Martyrology, but the Bollandists treat his life exhaustively under 17 Oct.

oddest name is one given a holy man, John Tientialbene, that is "*John stick to the good*," because he always repeated that phrase "Tien-ti-al-bene," which is the Italian for a less euphonious English phrase employed to urge us on to perseverance. His feast day occurs on the same day with Blessed John of Avelino (June 11). The word "stick" suggests another John called a *Baculo* whose feast falls on March 29.<sup>1</sup>

It would be a lengthy task to speak in detail of these and many other saints of the name John whom we must pass by altogether. In conclusion we merely call attention to the fact that there is a number of saints who have retained the diminutive form of the name, equivalent to our Johnny. Such as *Johannulus* (Apr. 28), *Johannillus* (May 29), *Johannicius* (Nov. 4), *Johannitius* (Aug. 1), or as another writes himself *Johannetus* (March 24), and *Johanninus* (Apr. 11). There is also a *Janbon* (Oct. 22), *Janibonus* for Joannes Bouus, and another of the same name whose feast occurs on Jan. 10.

H. J. HEUSER.

<sup>1</sup> The Bollandists only mention his name III, 88, n. 3 on the 22 April, where they say that, as they did not have his life in time to insert it in its proper place, they shall bring it in the Supplement.

## CONFERENCES.

## CAN WE USE THE FORM OF INFANT BAPTISM FOR ADULTS?

*Qu.* The question whether the *Ordo baptismi parvulorum* may be licitly used in the baptism of adults was recently discussed by several priests from two different dioceses. Neither of the parties claimed knowledge of the existence of a special indult in their respective dioceses, such as seems to be required by the Holy See when, in answer to the petition of the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore wherein they asked for an extension of the privilege previously granted for a period of twenty years, the S. Congregation replied: "Porro S. Congregatio censuit episcopos recurrere debere, expleto tempore postremae concessionis." (Cf. Plen. Conc. Balt. II, n. 243, annot. 3.) The argument offered in favor of using the privilege, formerly accorded our Bishops, was that the shorter rite is *sanctioned by custom*; on the other hand it was said that such custom is an abuse.

Will you kindly answer this much debated and very practical query?

*Resp.* If custom could sanction the use of a rite, granted under exceptional conditions, but against which there exists in ordinary circumstances defined liturgical law, the argument in favor of the shorter form might have some weight. As it is, the form to be used in the administration of the sacraments being prescribed by definite rubric "Nihil aliud concessum intelligendum est, nisi illud, quod est speciatim expressum; neque ex indulto uno alterove privilegio trahi potest consequentia ad alia quae singillatim descripta non fuerint." (S. R. C. 27 Aug., 1822.) There are numerous decisions of the Holy See which annul all customs against positive rubrical prescriptions of the *Ritual*, *Missal*, *Breviary*,



*Pontifical and Episcopal Ceremonial* and against the *authentic Decrees* interpreting these prescriptions.<sup>1</sup>

The following decisions will show the application of this rule to cases like the one in question. The Vicar Apostolic of Corea asked :

“Licitum sit mihi in posterum absque scrupulo dare Baptismum adultis, utendo, propter defectum temporis et nimiam defatigationem, caeremoniis pro pueris assignatis, sive sint pauci, sive multi.”

The answer was terse and unequivocal: *Stet Rituali Romano.* (S. C. S. Off. 12 Feb., 1851.)

A similar case is that of the Vicar Apostolic of Tonquin who stated that there existed a *custom* among the missionaries in China to use the shorter form of infant baptism for adults, and he pleaded not only the excessively hard work of the priests in these missions, but also the wish to have uniformity of practice introduced in a matter of such importance. The Propaganda replied that the Roman Ritual was to be strictly followed, *except in case of necessity.*

Some years later the matter was urged again and the Holy See then issued an indult explicitly sanctioning the custom for the Tonquin Missions under certain conditions. We give the words of the Holy See :

*S. C. de Prop. Fide Ex Aud. S. S. 30 Jan., 1803.*

SSmus instante Vic. Apost. Tunk. Occid. Apostolica auctoritate ac indulgentia declavarit servari posse consuetudinem, quam in Tunkino vigere expositum est, utendi in baptizandis adultis caeremoniis pro infantium Baptismate praescriptis, ubi id rationabilis necessitas, vel temporis angustia ad caeteras sacri ministerii functiones explendas, seu nimia missionariorum defatigatio exigit.

The above replies plainly show that the S. Congregation does not consider the custom of using the short form of Baptism prescribed in the Ritual for Infants as legitimate unless it have the *express* sanction of the Holy See. In the case of the Fathers of the Council who asked that the privi-

<sup>1</sup> “Quaecumque inveterata consuetudo in contrarium derogare nequit legi a Decretis S. R. C. prescriptae.” (S. R. C. 13 Aug. 1839.)

lege, previously granted for the space of twenty years, be extended without limitation in future or at least for another twenty years,<sup>1</sup> the Holy See answered that the Bishops would have to have recourse to Rome for an extension of the faculty at the expiration of the previous grant. We make no further comment. Each Bishop knows whether he has received the faculty, directly or indirectly, and *if he do not give explicit faculty to his clergy they cannot make use of the short form without violation of the Ritual prescription*, no matter how custom has it.

That we are rightly interpreting the sense of the reply given by the Holy See is further apparent from the action of the Propaganda in answer to the petition of our Bishops in the First Provincial Council of Baltimore. The plea given in 1829 for requesting the privilege of using the short form of Infant Baptism for Adults was (apart from the usual practice) the want of missionaries and their want of time—“*Missionariorum inopia et temporis angustiis in quibus Missionarii versantur, ut ceteris sacri Ministerii officiis fungi possint.*” The S. Congregation answered the request by granting it for twenty years.<sup>2</sup> When, in 1852 the Fathers of the Plenary Council of Baltimore asked the extension of this privilege for the reason that the former difficulties were still in existence, the S. Congregation answered that the Holy See would allow it for *five* years and that, in the meantime, *the Bishops should endeavor to bring about gradually the observance of the rite of adult baptism* as prescribed in the Roman Ritual. — “*Precibus istis relatis ab Emo ac Rmo. D. Raphaele Fornani in generali S. Congregationis conventu habitu die 30 Aug., 1852, Emi Patres censuerunt supplicandum SSo pro indulti prorogatione ad*

1 “*Quoniam gravissimae rationes a Patribus Concilii Primi Baltimorensis Provincialis allatae . . . adhuc videntur, immo in dies graviore evasurae videntur, statuunt Patres SS. supplicandum esse, ut privilegium tunc ad viginti annos juxta Patrum preces concessum, nunc perpetuum fiat vel saltem ad viginti annos iterum concedatur.*” Conc. Balt. Plen. II, n. 243, adn. 2.

2 Decret. 16 Oct., 1830.

quinquennium, atque ita ut interim Episcopi paulatim ad observantiam ritus descripti pro adultorum baptisate in Rituali Romano accedere satagant.”<sup>1</sup>

The wisdom of such a restriction in the use of a privilege granted principally by reason of necessity, *i. e.*, want of time to perform the proper and prescribed functions, under ordinary circumstances, must be apparent when we regard the great difference to-day of local missionary conditions in parts of the United States. In probably the great majority of our dioceses the plea of lack of time to perform the ceremonial of adult baptism cannot be conscientiously urged as in former times, and where the necessity for using the shorter ceremony actually exists everybody knows that the Bishop can easily and quickly obtain the faculty and let his clergy know the fact of their having a right to use it.

---

#### THE NAME OF THE ANGEL IN THE INCENSE PRAYER.

*Qu.* Blessing the incense after the Offertory in solemn Mass the Celebrant prays: “*Per intercessionem beati Michaelis Archangeli stantis a dextris altaris incensi, etc.*” Some maintain that this should be *Per intercessionem beati Gabrielis* and refer to De Herdt’s “*Praxis Liturgica*” (Vol. II, n. 77) which seems to favor this opinion, although the author cites a decree of the S. Congregation forbidding any change. If, as he says, the oldest Missals had actually *Gabrielis*, and the word *Michaelis* was introduced by an error of the transcribers, it seems to me that the S. Congregation would not have sanctioned it simply because it had custom in its favor, nor would the editors of the revised Missals under Pius V, Clement VIII and Urban VIII have failed to correct the error as they did in other instances.

*Resp.* De Herdt’s opinion rests upon the conjecture of Tommasi and Merati who judged that the passage makes allusion to St. Gabriel because the words “*stantis a dextris*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Concil. Plenar. totius Americae Sept. Foed., Baltimori habitum anno 1852; p. 157.

altaris incensi" are expressly referred to him in St. Luke I, 11-19. But this reasoning is not conclusive, as the learned Cistercian, Robert Sala, in his notes to Cardinal Bona's *Res Liturgicae* points out. The above words are, it is true, used by St. Luke in speaking of the Archangel Gabriel; yet they are equally applicable to St. Michael, who like Gabriel, is "one of the seven spirits standing before the throne of God offering to Him the prayers of the Saints," which St. John in the Apocalypse (viii, 3) expresses by the symbol of incense. Moreover, the Church does distinctly apply these words to St. Michael in one of her ancient Offices, the *Apparitio S. Michaelis Arch.*, (8 May.) where the passage "stetit angelus juxta aram templi, habens thuribulum aureum in manu sua" occurs repeatedly, suggesting that the scriptural phrase of St. Luke has been here adopted because of its equal appropriateness to St. Michael.

Nor is it true that the early Missals had the word *Gabrielis* where we have *Michaelis*. Some indeed, and among them one of the oldest codices in the Augustinian library in Rome has this reading, but there is the Cologne Missal of 1133 and others mentioned by Le Brun, in which the reading *Michaelis*, as we have it to-day, is to be found. Whence Sala concludes, what the S. Congregation has distinctly emphasized by its "*Nihil innovandum*" (25 Sept. 1706), namely, that the name of St. Michael is properly placed there and was intended by the Church, from time immemorial, to represent no other, because St. Michael is the angel of the Holy Sacrifice, who carries the prayers of the faithful before the throne of God. For the same reason we find him mentioned in the "Confiteor" at the beginning of Mass, and in the Offertory of Requiem Masses.

Indeed, wherever "the Angel" without any special name is mentioned in the Holy Sacrifice, we may safely assume it to stand for St. Michael, who is honored in the Church from the earliest ages, as the guardian of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the particular protector of the Church militant. I have just come upon a sentence in Gihl's excellent treatise on the Mass, citing Dionysius the Carthusian, whose remark in this

connection is strikingly to the point. "S. Michael ecclesiam visitat," writes that prolific commentator of the fifteenth century, "et ante ejus altare stat, *habens thuribulum aureum, i. e.*, charitatem praecipuam ad fideles, per quam eorum spiritualia sacrificia colligit Deoque offert; cui dantur incensa multa, quando Ecclesia ejus suffragia petit suasque preces per manus illius Deo offerri precatur." (In Apoc. Ennar. cap. viii, art. 9).

---

### THE ERECTION OF THE "VIA CRUCIS" AND THE WRITTEN PERMIT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW :

REVEREND SIR :—In your issue of January last you say : "For the valid erection of the 'Via Crucis' the *written* consent of the Ordinary of the Diocese is required in each separate case." Now this is certainly so : 1. When it is a Franciscan Father who erects the Stations of the Cross in places outside the jurisdiction of his Order ; 2. When the Stations are erected in virtue of a faculty derived from the Superior-General of the Franciscans ; and 3. At least most probably when the priest procures his faculty direct from the Apostolic See. But is it so also when a priest, who is placed in charge of a parish by his Bishop, receives a written or printed faculty for erecting the "Via Crucis" ? Must he too get a written permit from his Bishop for each separate erection within his own parish ? You say the conclusion that he must do so seems unavoidable, and in proof of this you cite, in the first place, a decree of the S. Congreg. of Indulgences. That decree (sub n. 445 ; 21 June, 1879), allow me to point out, has reference to the case of certain priests in France who obtained the faculty from the Superior-General of the Franciscans, and is therefore not applicable to the case of our priests who receive a faculty in *scriptis* from their Bishop.

You appeal, in the second place, to the action of Leo XIII who, at the request of the Propaganda, granted a *sanatio* in cases where the erection was deemed invalid owing to the injunction of procuring the *consensus ordinarii in scriptis* in each instance not having been complied with. To this I have to say that the mere fact of the Holy Father having granted the *sanatio* is not conclusive evidence that the erection was invalid in those cases. The petitioner thought

it was; asked that the *sanatio* be granted where the erection was invalid "ob causam in precibus enunciatam *vel ob quamcumque aliam causam*;" and the Holy Father, without entering into the merits of the case, accorded the favor asked. He added at the same time, it is true, that the consent of the Ordinary should be sought in writing for each separate erection, "ad avertendum quodcumque dubium." He does not say that this must be done *sub poena nullitatis*, but simply "curent parochi" etc., which I take it, means no more than that this is the safe course in doubtful cases *cum agitur de Via Crucis erigenda*. My reasons for so construing his words is the following statement contained in the "Instructio de Stationibus S. Viae Crucis auctoritate Min. Generalis tot. Ord. Fratrum Minorum edita et a S. Congr. Ind. approbata 1884." Wapelhorst quotes it in a footnote at page 490 of his *Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae*. It runs thus: "At *obtenta ab Episcopo in Scriptis facultate delegata*, et Parochi vel Superioris postulatione scripta, *non requiritur diversum instrumentum de eorum consensu*. (Instr. n. 30.)"

## CANADENSIS.

*Resp.* The explanation offered by our learned correspondent is as ingenious as it is positive. Unfortunately for the argument there exists an equally positive and much more authoritative statement to the contrary by the S. Congregation which made the law and is therefore its highest and safest interpreter.

We may pass over what is said regarding the obligation of the Franciscan Fathers, with whose duties we are not concerned, nor of priests who obtain their faculty *direct* from the Apostolic See. The question at issue is, whether priests who receive their faculties from the Ordinary of their diocese by virtue of a general concession to Bishops of the United States of America, as well as to missionary Bishops in Canada and elsewhere, can erect the stations without a written permit from the Ordinary for each case. The clause of the faculty in question, which is pertinent here, reads: "Erigendi in locis suae diocesis in quibus *non adsint PP. Franciscuales*, pium exercitium Viae Crucis. . . *addita insuper potestate hanc facultatem communicandi presbyteris sacro ministerio fungentibus.*" (Fac. Extraord. C. n. 10.)

Concerning this faculty our reverend correspondent asks :  
 " Must a priest (who is placed in charge of a parish by his Bishop) get a written permit from his Bishop for each separate erection within his own parish? You say that the conclusion that he must do so seems unavoidable and in proof of this you cite, in the first place, a decree of the S. Congr. of Indulg. That decree (sub. n. 445 ; Jun. 21, 1879), allow me to point out, has reference to the case of certain priests in France who obtained the faculty from the Superior-General of the Franciscans, and is therefore *not applicable* to the case of our priests who receive a faculty *in scriptis* from their Bishop."

This is quite novel and would be assuring if it were not a mere conjecture stated in form of a fact. The decree of 1879 is *applicable* to the case of priests who receive their faculty from the Bishop. This has been decided quite recently by the same Congregation which originally made the decree, which proves that our interpretation was perfectly correct. Here are the words of the S. C. Ind. The italics are ours.

S. S. Indulg. Aug. 6, 1890. An ipsa concessio *episcopi qui ab Ap. Sede facultatem obtinuit* erigendi Stationes Viae Crucis, item scripto fieri debeat sub poena nullitatis ?

R. *Affirmative* : et cf. Decretum Jun. 21, 1879.

The decree referred to in the answer is as follows :

S. C. Indulg. Jun. 21, 1879. An consensus Ordinarii in scriptis requiratur sub poena nullitatis *in singulis casibus pro unaquaque* stationum erectione ; vel sufficiat ut sit generice praestitus pro erigendis stationibus in certo numero ecclesiarum vel oratoriorum, sine specifica designatione loci.

R. *Affirmative* ad primam partem ; *Negative* ad secundam.

In the light of this response it would be irrelevant to discuss the extent to which the late *sanatio* may be applied.

---

#### A CASE OF "MIXED MARRIAGE."

Mary, a Catholic, is engaged to John, a Methodist. John is a widower, but had been divorced from his first wife before her death. John protests, so Mary says, that he will be eternally faithful to

Mary, but she fears that, as the Methodist Church allows divorce, and as John has been already divorced, he may one day take it into his head to get a divorce from her also. Mary states that she is willing to follow the advice of her pastor, but that, as she loves John, and has never had, and may never have again so good an offer of marriage, she wants to marry him *if it be lawful*.

1. Should the pastor apply for dispensation in such a case?
2. What guarantee, if the dispensation be applied for, should John give that he intends to bind himself indissolubly?
3. As most Protestants think divorce to be lawful, is it not necessary, in every particular case, to have some guarantee that they mean to contract indissolubly?
4. What is the best advice to be given under the circumstances?

*Resp.* The danger of divorce seems to us to have but little weight in this instance, at least from the practical point of view. Before stating the reason we permit ourselves a few observations on the general aspect of such cases in the pastoral care.

It is *a priori* unlawful to allow marriages of this kind without serious protest, on the ground of *mixta religio*, or if John have not been baptized, of *disparitas cultus*, the first of which constitutes an impediment which *forbids* the marriage, the last an impediment which *annuls* the marriage unless contracted with previous dispensation.

The first step, therefore, would be to point out to Mary the danger, not only of being forced to a divorce if John's affection for her should cease, but the far greater danger which is likely to jeopardize her happiness in the future by reason of a difference in feelings, views and beliefs concerning so vital an interest as religion and the eternal salvation of her soul, since domestic felicity depends, with rare exceptions, upon union of sentiment between husband and wife, and also their children, who cannot be rightly guided by parents who differ, or perhaps oppose each other, in their estimate of what is essential for the eternal welfare of their little ones.

All this should serve to dissuade her from the contemplated alliance unless there is hope that John will examine and embrace the Catholic faith. It may be well to remember that where there is a real affection between the parties it



requires often only a certain amount of courage, on the part of the girl, to tell the man that she will not marry a non-Catholic, and that if he truly loves her he will not think too little of her faith (which she holds dearer than life) to examine it carefully and conscientiously, and embrace it if he feels convinced of its truth. The priest to whom he applies for instruction has then an opportunity of showing the evil of mixed marriage and correcting his views about the faith. If John refuse this reasonable test, he gives cause to Mary to doubt that a union between them would end happily for either, or for the offspring, should such be the result of the marriage.

If, however, the attachment between them has grown to such an extent as to cause the fear that they would eventually marry despite the urgings of religion—or else, that some other equally grave evil would result from a refusal to marry them, then *prudence dictates that the dispensation be obtained.*

In this case Mary is to be instructed that, as a Catholic, she is obliged to insist upon the three usual conditions of perfect liberty in the exercise of her faith, of the Catholic education of all the children in case God so bless the marriage, and that by good example of her life and in every other legitimate way she will induce her husband to adopt the same religious convictions with her. The consent to the first *two* conditions should be obtained from John in some authentic form, so as to protect Mary against a possible change of sentiment.

Many pastors have the practice of presenting a document, containing the above conditions, drawn up in regular form which the non-Catholic party signs before witnesses. This is obviously a delicate proceeding and may give offence unless done with much tact. Hence others prefer to acquaint the parties with the conditions and obtain their *verbal* consent, but have the conditions mentioned in the regular marriage certificate which is handed to the Catholic party, and also have the consent stated in the marriage Register. In some cases the honorable character of the parties makes a written instrument altogether needless. Only personal discretion can determine which method to adopt in particular cases.

As for the guarantee against a possible divorce, it seems to us quite needless in such cases. Either the parties are happy, and then they don't want a divorce ; or else they are unhappy in each other's society and in that case Mary could only be benefited by a divorce, which for her, would mean simply separation from a disagreeable husband (though she could not marry again whilst he lives) who is obliged by law to support her, unless she herself gives cause and pleads for the divorce.

---

#### THE PRAYER IN THE TITULAR OFFICE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST.

Mgr. Leo. Haid, O.S.B., Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina, some time ago requested of the S. Congregation of Rites the solution of the following doubt : " Which prayer is to be recited, at Lauds and Vespers, in the *Suffragia*, by priests attached to churches whose titular is St. John Baptist, since there are two feasts of the Saint, namely that of his nativity (June 24) and that of his martyrdom (Aug. 29) ? "

The S. Congr. replied :

The prayer to be recited in the *Suffragia* is that of the Nativity of St. John Baptist with a change of the word *nativitate* into *commemorazione*.

---

#### TERTIARIES OF DIFFERENT ORDERS.

In January of last year the S. Congregation decided that a person could not be a Tertiary member of several religious Orders. Previously it had occurred that Tertiaries of one Community joined another in the hope of profiting by the privileges accorded to both. Hence the question whether the decree acted backward, and if so, how persons affiliated to two or more approved religious Orders were to act in order not to forfeit the privileges of membership in each.

The answer of the S. C. was that persons who had been affiliated to several Orders before the promulgation of the above-mentioned decree, were free to choose one of the Orders according to their devotion, and that they would be considered legitimate members of the same in future.

## ANALECTA.

## VARIORUM DUBIORUM SOLUTIO.

*(Ex S. R. C. 16 Jun. 1893.)*

## GUANA.

Illmus ac Rmus Dnus Antonius Sebastianus Valente, hodiernus Patriarcha Indiarum Orientalium atque Archiepiscopus Goanus, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi insequentia Dubia, pro opportuna solutione subiecit, nimirum :

*Dubium I.* An stantes, aut genuflexi esse debeant Caonici initio Missae privatae Episcopi et ad benedictionem cum eidem Missae assistunt? Insuper in dicta assistentia an uti possint insignibus canonicalibus, an tantum superpelliceo, vel etiam rochetto, si eius privilegio fruantur?

*Dubium II.* Potestne tolerari quod in Officio Ferae IV, V et VI Maioris Hebdomadae cantus Lamentationum, Responsoriorum et Psalmi *Miserere* fiat simul cum sono organi aut aliorum instrumentorum, et quod perdurante expositione Sanctissimi Sacramenti, concinantur versiculi (mottetti) pariter cum sono organi aut aliorum instrumentorum musicalium, sive horis vespertinis Ferae V, sive de mane Ferae VI eiusdem Maioris Hebdomadae?

*Dubium III.* In cantu Evangelii Passionis D. N. I. C. per Maiorem Hebdomadam potestne admitti :

(a) usus tribi pluteorum sive legivorum et totidem librorum.

(b) quod cantores habeant faciem conversam ad Celebrantem?

(c) quod unus cantor sit in ambone et alii duo in separato quoque altiori?

(d) cum Celebrans defectu ministrorum debeat esse unus ex cantoribus Evangelii Passionis, debetne se collocare a cornu Evangelii, an vero a cornu Epistolae?

*Dubium IV.* In aliquibus Goanae Archidioeceseos Ecclesiis celebratur festum Transitus Beatae Mariae Virginis a die 13 ad diem 14 Augusti, processionem qua defertur imago ipsius Deiparae in feretro deposita ac si demortua iaceret, ibique relinquitur usque ad primas Vesperas diei Assumptionis, tunc imago erecta sistitur ac si viva esset. Licetne huiusmodi usus cum hisce ritibus tolerare?

*Dubium V.* Potestne tolerari ut velo seu pallio contegatur imago D. N. I. C. in processione Ferae VI Maioris Hebdomadae quod generatim in Goana Archidioecesi locum

obtinere quemadmodum etiam in processione super memorata Transitus B. M. V. fieri solet?

*Dubium VI.* Prohibendusne erit usus contegendi ramis et floribus tumulos, qui eriguntur in Ecclesiis occasione funeralium?

*Dubium VII.* In Seminario Racholensi quotannis celebratur cum magno pompae apparatu dies qua fit initium scholarum. Quaeritur utrum huiusmodi solemnitas praebet sufficiens motivum celebrandi, uti fit, Missam votivam solemnem de Spiritu Sancto? Et quatenus affirmative, poteritne Ordinarius indulgere veniam, ut in perpetuum haec Missa celebretur?

*Dubium VIII.* Quum Ecclesia praefati Seminarii Titularem habeat S. Ignatium de Loyola, debetne eiusdem Sancti nomen commemorari in oratione "A cunctis" in Missis quae celebrantur in Oratorio interiori Seminarii, loco nominis Sancti Patroni loci?

*Dubium IX.* Potestne Ordinarius locorum transferre propter quodvis etiam leve motivum festivitates quoad solemnitatem extrinsecam, et permittere quod in die proprio Festi solummodo Missa diei cantetur absque alia pompa in eadem Ecclesia, ubi celebranda erit festivitas in aliam diem translata?

*Dubium X.* Debetne aboleri, an servari potest communis praxis existens in Archidioecesi Goana, quamvis ea sit contraria praescripto Ritualis, quod nempe in mandandis sepulturae clericis vel pueris, Parochus, loco praecedendi sequatur feretrum, saltem quando hoc defertur a clericis?

*Dubium XI.* Utrum Episcopo adsistente in throno Missae celebratae ab aliquo qui habeat dignitatem in Capitulo, possit hic sedere ad hymnum "Gloria" et ad "Credo" contra thronum Episcopi in sella instructa branchiis et fulcramento pro humeris?

*Dubium XII.* Utrum Canonicis Missam celebrantibus solemnioribus diebus, cum vel sine adsistentia Episcopi, liceat uti alba ornata fimbriis seu reticula a cingulo deorsum?

*Dubium XIII.* Utrum quando Ordinarius committit administrationem alicuius Parochialis Ecclesiae Sacerdoti Regulari, debeat hic sequi in celebratione Missae Kalendarium Dioecesanum an proprium Ordinis? et quatenus affirmative pro Kalendario proprio Ordinis, utrum Sacerdotes saeculares in eadem Ecclesia celebrantes debeant Dioecesanum Kalendarium sequi, etiam si id importet differentiam quoad colorem paramentorum?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem infrascripti

Secretarii, omnibus mature perpensis, ita propositis dubiis rescribendum censuit, videlicet :

Ad I. Stare debent tantum ad benedictionem, et adhibeant solummodo rochettum cum superpelliceo.

Ad II. Negative quoad Lamentationes, Responsoria et Psalmum "*Miserere*," nec non ad reliquas liturgicas partes : in versiculis autem coram Sanctissimo Sacramento tolerari posse, attenta antiqua consuetudine.

Ad III. Affirmative ad 1<sup>am</sup> partem : Negative ad 2 et 3 : ad 4 Affirmative ad primam quaestionem, et Detur Decretum in Tridentina 14 Martii 1836 ad 4 : Negative ad secundam.

Ad IV, V, VI. Tolerari posse.

Ad VII. Ad primam partem decernendum ab Episcopo : ad 2 Negative.

Ad VIII. In Oratorio privato Seminarii Racholensis, in oratione "*A cunctis*" exprimendum est nomen Sancti Titularis Ecclesiae eiusdem Seminarii.

Ad IX. Negative.

Ad X. Servetur Rituale Romanum Tit. 6, c. 3, n. 1.

Ad XI. Obstant Decreta.

Ad XII. Tolerari posse.

Ad XIII. Ad 1<sup>am</sup> partem detur Decretum in Tuden. 23 Maii 1840 ad 5 : ad 2<sup>am</sup> partem, Dilata.

Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit. Die 16 Iunii 1893.

✠ CAJ. Card. ALOISI-MASELLA, S. R. C. Praef.

Pro R. P. D. VINCENTIO NUSSI, S. R. C. Secr.

Can. IOANNES PONZI, Subst.

## DE CONFRATERNITATE SACRAE FAMILIAE.

### OFFICIUM ET MISSA S. FAMILIAE.

#### *Decretum.*

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Leo Papa XIII. Consociationem a Sancta Familia, quae laetos atque uberes fructus iam in Ecclesia ferebat, per Litteras diei XIV. Iunii superioris anni eo salutari consilio approbavit, ut familiae christianae arctiori pietatis nexu Sanctae eidem Familiae devincirentur, et Iesus, Maria ac Ioseph familias sibi deditas tamquam rem propriam tuerentur ac foverent. Quo vero inter fideles cultus erga eandem Sanctam Familiam in dies augeatur, plurimi amplissimi diversarum nationum Episcopi ipsi Sanctissimo Domino Nostro humillimis precibus supplicarunt, ut, quemadmodum iam in aliquibus locis obtinebat,

Officium et Missam in honorem Sanctae Familiae Nazarenae sibi, religiosisque Congregationibus petentibus concedere dignaretur.

Porro, quum in peculiari officio, iamdiu in quibusdam Diocesisibus adhibito, nonnulla immutare opus esset; visum fuit novum Officium et Missae schema conficere, quod reapse de speciali Apostolica Auctoritate concinnatum, et prouti in superiori exemplari prostat, per me infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Praefectum, una cum R. P. D. Augustino Caprara, Sanctae Fidei Promotore, diligenter revisum, a meipso Cardinali subsignata die eidem Sanctissimo Domino Nostro exhibitum fuit. Sanctitas vero Sua illud in omnibus approbare dignata est, benigneque indulgit, ut Festum ipsius Sanctae Familiae cum Officio ac Missa propriis a singulis Sacrorum Antistitibus pro Clero sibi commissae Dioceseos, atque a religiosis Congregationibus petentibus, sub ritu Duplicis maioris Dominicae III. post Epiphaniam recoli valeat: simulque mandavit, ut in locis ubi huc usque Festum Sanctae Familiae celebratum est, illud praefatae Dominicae III. post Epiphaniam affigatur, novumque Officium cum Missa antiquo in posterum substituat: servatis Rubricis. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Die 14 Iunii, 1893.

C. Card. ALOISI-MASELLA,  
S. R. C., Praejectus.

L. ✠ S.

VINCENTIUS NUSSI,  
S. R. C., Secretarius.

## DUBIA DE ERECTIONE CONFRATERNITATUM SACRAE FAMILIAE.

### I.

RME DOMINE :

Emus Card. Parocchi, Archiconfrat. S. Familiae Praeses, per me infrascriptum propositis dubiis respondet :

I. An requiratur in singulis paroeciis erectio canonica ab Episcopo ad instar Confraternitatum proprie dictarum? *Resp. Negative*; fit per diploma quod Emus Praeses mittet.

II. An requiratur declaratio authentica, per diploma in scriptis vel alio modo ab Episcopo vel moderatore de erectione consociationis in singulis paroeciis? *Resp. Negative*; sed moderator servet quae in Regulis habentur (III, b).

III. An pro lucrandis Indulgentiis requiratur ut a singulis parochiis obtineatur pagina aggregationis a Card. Praeside subscripta, uti innuere videntur regulae (II, a), ad modum aggregationis Confraternitatum proprie dictarum? *Resp. Affirmative et*

*ad mentem.* Mens vero est, ut Episcopus, uno accepto ab Emo Praeside diplomate, reliqua ipse curabit imprimi ad normam illius, et singulis familiis consociatis tradet.

IV. An festum S. Familiae, associationis primarium, die Dominica infra Oct. Epiph., etiam iis in dioecesisbus recoli debeat, in quibus ea die fit in choro solemnitas Epiphaniae? *Resp. Affirmative*; sed Episcopus aliam festivitatem seligere potest pro sua prudentia.

Romae, ex Aedibus Vicariatus, die 7 Aprilis, 1893.

RAPHAEL CHIMENTI,

*Pro-Secret. CONF. S. FAM.*

(Rmo Dno Kargst, Vic. gen. Dioc. Maten).

## II.

*Dub. I.* An sufficiat ut parochus solum nomen patris vel capitis familiae in tabulas Consociationis Sacrae Familiae referat, vel singula familiae membra inscribere debeat? *Resp. Negative* ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

*Dub. II.* An parochus pro inscriptione familiarum alterum sacerdotem delegare possit? *Resp.* Nil vetat quominus parochus in familiarum inscriptione sacerdotem adhibeat adiutorem.

*Dub. III.* An sufficiat ut familiae in sociorum numerum adsciscipientes hoc suum desiderium per litteras vel interpositas personas parochi intiment, vel omnino requiratur ut caput familiae vel eiusdem membrum quoddam coram parochi eum in finem personaliter comperat? *Resp.* Omnino decet ut caput familiae personaliter sistat apud parochum.

---

## HYMNI IN LINGUA VERNACULA CORAM SSMO. EXPOSITO.

### *Dubium*

Utrum liceat generaliter ut chorus musicorum, id est cantorum, coram SSMo. Sacramento solemniter exposito decantent hymnos in lingua vernacula?

*Resp.* S. C. S. Rit. "Posse, dummodo non agatur de hymno *Te Deum*, et aliis quibuscumque liturgicis precibus quae non nisi latina lingua decantari debent. (Die 27 Febr., 1882. *Leavenworth.*)

## BOOK REVIEW.

**GESCHICHTE DES DEUTSCHEN VOLKES.**—Cultur-zustaende seit Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zum Beginn des dreissigjaehrigen Krieges. VII B. Von Johannes Janssen. Ergaenzt u. herausgegeben von Ludwig Pastor. 1-12 Aufl.—Freiburg im Br.—B. Herder. 1893. (St. Louis, Mo.)

Every scholar in the field of history and religious polemics will admit the fairness of the canon which the great German historian of our day, Johannes Janssen, proposed to himself and to which he rigorously adhered to the last, in the composition of his history. He began his labor of collecting material in 1854. At that time he could hardly have foreseen what it would cost him to pursue the task he had proposed for himself and whether he might ever see the end of it even with a blessed old age. But he had mapped out his life work and determined upon doing, whatever the issue. For twenty-five years hardly anyone was aware of what was the mean- of the German professor's constant journeys and the search in the long neglected archives of every important library in Europe, and the company of intelligent and careful transcribers employed by him for the purpose of accurate copy. Then, all at once the first volume, covering a small but important period of past mediæval history, appeared. It began with the new epoch ushered in by the invention of the printer's art, and surveyed the condition of popular and higher education at the time in Germany, where the so-called Reformation planted its first seed of religious dissension. How that seed developed, fostered by the gathering corruption of princes, the liberalism in doctrine, and laxity in morals among all grades of the clergy, and the effect which this state of things produced upon the economic, the social and political sphere, are traced in clear successive delineation.

But that which gave to the whole work from its first beginning an authority carrying with it the conviction of self-evidence, was the method which the author pursued; in his laborious compilation. He did not "make" history, as others had done before him; but he laid bare the facts that they might tell their own story with the unmistakeable candour of seeing and hearing witnesses. The prevailing system of writing history had been very different. The author would take a stand whence to view the past; that position would be largely determined by the side which gave him his early



light, by the convenient access to his favorite resources, by the direction of the wind-prophet. Thus a one-sided sketch was usually produced which gave the accidental reader no full view of the rear construction, the trenches or elevations which most often indicate the true capacity, the strength or weakness of a citadel. Not so with Janssen. He exposed, like the careful workmen on the present sites of ancient Greece, the cities as once they stood; only digging away the dust and rubbish of four centuries. He hardly makes a comment even to explain the meaning of an overturned arch or a broken tablet. He simply takes the student by the hand, leads him to the place of the excavation, and bids him look down from the elevated stand of the present upon the hollow area below, where he may trace the avenues with their temples and palaces of long ago. And in the full glare of an unbiassed sunlight the spectator catches the proportions from whatever side he may view the once buried monuments. The reader of history forms his own estimate and that estimate comes nearer to the truth than any of those grand front elevations or side views which show and hide what the mind of the writer wishes to show and hide—knowing or feeling that “the world wants to be deceived.” Janssen’s history consists altogether of documentary evidence. His aim is to secure first the truth of facts,—thence a simple analysis will easily lead the just mind to a right judgment as to the forces which operate in their production. His object was, of course, as it must needs be in any historian who labors for truth in the Christian sense, to vindicate the Catholic Church founded by Christ and secured from defection by the indwelling, unto the end, of the Divine Spirit. And this is an important point to keep in view; for there is a vague but general impression among apologists of the present day, that in order to shield the Church from the imputation of fallibility we must hide the defects of her children and her representatives. Such a course does much harm, by producing a weak and timid feeling open to skepticism, and a disposition to deny whatever tells against Catholics, where the evidence of facts calls for a very different line of conduct. Janssen, on the contrary, follows the history of facts, ignoring nothing, embellishing or depreciating nothing, but forcing the capable mind to reflection by the contrast of results traced link by link in their connection to the true cause of good and evil among men.

The swiftness with which the superiority and incisiveness of this method was recognized by friend and foe is amply attested in the unparalleled popularity of the work on its very first appearance in

Germany. Before the second volume could be issued, the twelfth edition, we believe, of the first volume had been exhausted. The author was not, however, to go without sharp criticism and challenge from the representative leaders of Protestant thought in the land of critical historians. The onslaught gave occasion to deepen the general conviction of Janssen's fairness by calling forth fresh evidence of fact in two supplementary volumes, a first and second "reply to critics," after which the humiliated sages of evangelical orthodoxy thought it wiser to hold their peace.

Janssen lived to see the publication of the sixth volume of his gigantic undertaking. He had found it necessary, owing to the accumulation of original material, to divide his subject, and had dwelt thus far, mainly upon the political aspect of Germany beginning with the latter end of the Middle Ages. It was his next purpose to treat with equal accuracy and impartiality the social status, covering the same period as far as the thirty years' war. This part would deal with art and popular literature, with schools and universities, culture and science in their relation to the economic, social and religious progress of the German people. In the spring of 1891 the historian took seriously sick. He expressed the presentiment that he would not be able to finish the task he had set himself on earth. But up to the second day before his death which occurred on Christmas eve of the same year, he continued to labor at the work, arranging, noting, correcting, in order to make the continuation of it possible to the friend and pupil whom he had chosen as the heir of his burden.

Ludwig Pastor, whose history of the mediæval Popes in which he followed the plan of original and impartial research suggested by his illustrious master, has made his name familiar to the student of every land as a peer by the side of Janssen in the field of historic inquiry, undertook the work committed to him, and in the present volume attests how worthy he was of that confidence.

Pastor found only a small fraction of the six hundred and thirty pages contained in the volume before us ready for the press. The rest of the existing MS. material had to be arranged and revised. The citations and references had to be verified, a task of no trivial kind, often requiring a search through many volumes of ephemeral literature in which the memory of the dead author could have quickly located them, but which were like grains in a straw-stack to any one else. In many cases the references were mere notes to indicate what particular books might be of service in furnishing

light on a given subject under discussion ; this embraced a large range of recently published literature which Janssen had been hitherto unable to peruse. It needs no assurance from the painstaking editor of this seventh volume to convince the reader of the fidelity with which Pastor has carried out every suggestion so far as he knew or divined the purpose of his erudite predecessor.

Nor was the work, as originally proposed, to be accomplished by merely utilizing the material left by Janssen. He had, indeed, like any thoughtful projector of an important work, traced the outline of his history up to the year 1806, indicating the position into which the existing documents, many of which remain still unsearched, were to be grouped. It fell to the lot of Pastor to fill in the incomplete parts among which were the chapters treating of the Natural Sciences, Medicine, the study of Philosophy and Theology, Catholic and Protestant Translations of the Bible into the vernacular, Social demoralization and criminal statistics together with the prevailing system of administering justice. The last two of these topics are reserved for the eighth volume.

It would take the book critic too far to illustrate all the wealth of information here brought together. Like a living panorama the days and scenes of the sixteenth century repeat themselves before us, men speaking and acting as they then did, without varnish or adaptation. We see and hear Luther and his contemporaries. His views about everything and their views about him. Life at the Universities, Catholic and Protestant, the so-called Humanists, the study of philology and Latin, of jurisprudence, of mathematics and astronomy, the method of writing history at the time, the theories of the Paracelsites and other quacks as warring against the truly scientific systems of the day, the multiform development of polemic agitation in theology, the vernacular versions of the Scriptures and the influence of their sudden popularity upon homiletics, the Index, spread of books and newspapers—such are the principal topics treated in the spirit of perfect candor and impartiality. There is much in all this that should make us Catholics blush for the laxity of our ancestors, above all among the clergy and the Episcopate. But when you sum it up it only makes for the truth as testified to by the Catholic Church which has outlived the wrangling and weakness of her children and the attacks of her enemies. *Magna est veritas et praevalabit.* These were some of the last words pencilled by Janssen upon a slip of paper which contained suggestions for the preface of this seventh volume.

**THE PRIEST IN THE PULPIT: A Manual of Homiletics and Catechetics.** By Rev. I. Schuech, O.S.B. Transl. from the German by Rev. B. Luebbermann. With Preface by Most Rev. Wm. H. Elder, D.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1894.

At last we have, through the exertions of a learned Seminary professor of St. Mary's of the West, the first instalment of a well adapted work on Pastoral Theology. The author, a devout son of St. Benedict, had revised his book in nine successive editions ere he died, a very short time ago. The present translation is made from the eighth edition and comprises the first of three volumes, treating in turn of the pastoral activity in the pulpit, in the sanctuary and in the homes of the parishioners.

The present volume, mainly concerned with the priest as preacher and teacher, presents such striking features of excellence as to choice of matter and method of development, that the reviewer, in a short notice, is apt to fail in giving a just estimate of the practical value of the book.

The introductory chapter defines the scope of Pastoral Theology and its relation to other branches of ecclesiastical science; it points out the sources and helps to its practical study found especially in the Fathers of the Church and the Conciliar Enactments of various countries and times up to our own.

Next it reviews the requisite qualifications of the pastor, in the natural and supernatural order, for the right exercise of the holy ministry. The subject-matter of the three articles aptly condenses the marks of a true vocation to the priesthood and the precepts by the observance of which it is preserved and fostered.

After these preliminaries which cover some seventy pages of the volume and establish, so to speak, the point of view from which the subsequent treatise on the office of the priest as *Teacher* of his people is to be regarded, the subject of preaching is discussed under the various heads indicated in most approved works on Catholic Homiletics, and giving sound rules for the conduct of the preacher, as well as the choice, division and presentation of his matter. We do not know that anything new could be said on this subject, and the old principles rather gain than lose of their force when stated in the old analytic way. The second part of the volume, which treats of *Catechetical* Instruction, seems to us by far the most important, not only because the subject is so thoroughly and prac-

tically presented, but because it is the rule to attach much less importance to this branch of the pastoral office, than it deserves. Archbishop Elder, in his preface to the book, dwells upon this point in a way which makes the introductory pages of the volume of special worth to the clerical reader in the United States. "Most important," says his Grace, "we hold to be the instructions which our author gives on the teaching of catechism to children. . . . In these chapters on catechism it is shown how to descend to the level of the child and enable him to receive the truths into his mind, make them his own and assimilate them. A great deal of very zealous labor in teaching children fails of much of its fruit, from a want of knowing how to interest their attention, and how to convey into their minds the truths expressed by words. . . . Our author shows how to train children to apply their instructions at once to the good of their own souls. . . ." And what is here said of children applies to many, perhaps the great majority, of our Catholic grown people. We have heard of a pastor who invited to his catechism class on Sunday afternoons all the children up to the age of ninety ; in fact he insisted that, if anybody had to be left at home, it should be the school children, for whose salvation he feared but little as long as they attended the parochial school during week days. How quickly Catholics would rise to a high appreciation of their faith, and at the same time impress their unbelieving and prejudiced neighbors with the excellence of the Catholic religion, if pastors could find a way to establish in their parishes on Sunday afternoons regular catechetical instructions for the people, which by dint of being made continually interesting might become the talk and attraction of the most cultured as well as the humbler classes of our people, as was the case when Mgr. Dupanloup first took charge of the catechism classes in Paris.

There is a fine chapter on catechetical education, which, in two articles, teaches how to lead children to a *practice* of their faith and how to prepare them for the reception of the different sacraments, to which we would call special attention on account of its practical character ; the more so since the impression which P. Schuech's work is apt to leave on the reader at first is that it is somewhat technical and over-didactic. To the student such method of treatment is a necessity, and to the priest it can hardly prove a difficulty if he retain anything of the seminarian's habits of thought.

To allay the apprehensions, often very just, of those who distrust translations from foreign works as ill adapted to the circumstances

of our New World, we must add, that the translator, with judicious care, has not only eliminated from the English version such topics as have no bearing upon the missionary status of the United States, but substituted and inserted references to the decrees of our National Councils and to such commentaries upon them as Dr. Smith's *Elementa*, etc. Of course there necessarily remains something of the air of translation, but this can hardly be avoided, and we must be grateful to the Rev. Luebbemann for having made so excellent a work as the above accessible to the English reader.

**INDIAN AND WHITE IN THE NORTH-WEST.** By the Rev. L. B. Palladino, S.J. Helena, Montana: Published by Subscription. (Announcement.)

We depart from the ordinary custom of the book-reviewer to announce the proposed publication of a work which will prove a "find" to students of American history and to all readers who are interested in a truthful presentation of facts relating to the development of Catholic faith and education among the settlers and native Indians of the great North-west. The learned Jesuit, with whose writings on similar topics many are already familiar, has ready for publication an exhaustive work under the above-named title, to be printed at once if a sufficient number of subscribers can be found to second the undertaking. The work promises to be of great interest, not only from an historical point of view, but by reason of the multiform features of adventure and romance which naturally, and withal true, enter into the life and activity of early pioneers in such parts. To the Catholic educator the story of the tireless efforts of the Jesuits and the missionaries, with the marvelous results attained as the outcome of Christian self-sacrifice and Christian teaching, will be a new lesson, and, as Bishop Brondel writes in his preface to the book, "a surprise to the many who still consider Montana as belonging to the Wild West." Its pages will prove once more "that Christianity and civilization go hand in hand, and produce the happiest results."

It may be well to remember that the author of this work is the honored champion who defended by solid argument of facts the rights of our Catholic Indian schools, when the narrow-minded and openly anti-Catholic Government Commissioner, within the last few years, ruthlessly exercised his influence to destroy the Catholic schools by attempting to turn them over to infidel and sectarian hands.

We can entertain no doubt that our readers will aid in a decidedly good work, and benefit themselves by making this publication practicable at an early date. For this reason the *name and address* of intending subscribers must be sent at once to the Rev. L. B. Palladino, S.J., Helena, Montana. The work is to be paid for when received.

**LE CANADA ECCLESIASTIQUE**, Almanach-annuaire du Clergé Canadien. Publié par Cadieux et Derome, pour l'année 1894. (Huitième Année.) Montréal.

**HOFFMANN'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY**, Almanac and Clergy-List. Quarterly for 1894. Containing complete reports of the Dioceses in the United States, Canada and Newfoundland, Vic. Apost. Sandwich Islands, and the Hierarchy in Germany and Austria-Hungary. Vol. 9, n. I.—Milwaukee: Hoffmann Bros. Co. 1894. Pr. 50c.

**SADLIERS' CATHOLIC DIRECTORY**, Almanac and Ordo for 1894. Issued Quarterly, with full official reports of all Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures, etc., in the United States, Canada, B. W. Indies, Ireland, England and Scotland. Sixty-second year. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1894. Pr. \$1.25.

The relative merit of the above-mentioned Church-Directories consists in their covering to an extent different ground, except in the case of Canada which enjoys the benefit of two English besides the French edition. Sadlier's reports include the British Isles, which fact probably accounts for the difference in price between it and Hoffmann's. The latter contains a really handsome geographical chart showing the position of Catholic dioceses for the United States. As to accuracy of details it may be supposed that, in such a multiplicity of varying statistics, errors will necessarily occur. Nevertheless, since the main object of these summaries is to guide those who may be in search of local references, it is important that the errors should be reduced to a minimum. Comparing the Milwaukee with the New York edition, in various parts, we find the former decidedly more accurate in tracing what might be considered important changes among the local clergy. Thus, to take only a few instances from the beginning: Sadlier's Directory indi-

cates no changes in the St. Thomas College faculty attached to the University, although these changes were known months ago and are found in Hoffmann's. Here and there the same person holds two positions which can hardly be combined except by miracle, as when a prominent priest who appears on the obituary list in front, is at the same time mentioned as acting pastor of the church in the cemetery of which he rests for several months. The Hoffmanns evidently have a system of avoiding such errors, for which purpose it seems to be insufficient to get a list from the chancery of each diocese just before the end of the year.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- DAS APOSTOLISCHE GLAUBENSBEKENNTNISS.** Eine apologetisch—geschichtliche Studie, mit Rücksicht auf den "Kampf um das Apostolicum." Von Clemens Blume, S.J.—Freiburg, Br. B. Herder, 1893. St. Louis, Mo. Price, \$1.15.
- MANUEL DU PRETRE AUX ETATS-UNIS EN ANGLAIS ET EN FRANCAIS.** Contenant des tables, formules, règles et courtes instructions en anglais et en français. Par Louis de Goesbriand, évêque de Burlington, Vt.—Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati, 1894. Price, \$1.00.
- EDWARDS' CATECHISM OF HYGIENE,** for use in schools. By Joseph F. Edwards, A.M., M.D. Published by the author.—Catholic School Book Co., New York.
- A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.** Abridged from the Catechism prepared and enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, No. 1. New edition with word-meanings at the head of each chapter.—Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1893,
- THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.** Consisting of four editorials on the above subject published in the Catholic Mirror.—The Catholic Mirror, Baltimore, Md.
- OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE SANCTAE.** A Dominica in Palmis usque ad Sabbatum in Albis. 16 mo. Fr. Pustet: Ratisbonae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati, 1894. Price, 85 c.
- JUBILEE GREETING TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEAGUE OF THE SACRED HEART** of St. Francis Xavier's Church, New York City. Jubilee Year, 1894.



# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.—MAY, 1894.—NO. 5.

---

## OUR READING.

### A CLERIC'S ADDRESS TO HIS LOOKING-GLASS.

Intellectually man is ruminant, and he gets little permanent benefit from literary browsing unless he afterwards chews the cud.—*Dr. Thomas Hill.*

Reading is useful only in proportion as it aids our intellectual development ; it aids our intellectual development only in proportion as it supplies food for reflection ; and that portion of one's reading alone avails which the mind has been enabled to assimilate to itself, and make its own by meditation.—*Brother Azarias.*

A habit of reading idly debilitates and corrupts the mind for all wholesome reading ; the habit of reading wisely is one of the most difficult to acquire, needing strong resolution and infinite pains ; and reading for mere reading's sake, instead of for the good we gain from reading, is one of the worst and commonest and most unwholesome habits we have.—*Frederic Harrison.*

“Tell me thy company and I'll tell thee what thou art,” says the proverb-pregnant Sancho Panza : and the adage will lose nothing of its wisdom if to the term “company,” we give a more comprehensive meaning than Don Quixote's worthy squire probably had in mind. Intercourse with this or that class of one's fellow-beings is not the only kind of companionship that influences the character and serves as a generally truthful index thereof. Books are no less companions than are men and women ; and where the choice of one's living company is necessarily restricted, these inanimate friends of our predilection often furnish a far truer estimate of our real character and tastes than does the social circle in which we ordinarily move. As applied to many a man and especially to many a priest, constrained by force of

circumstances to dwell in a sphere more or less destitute of congenial society, an apter rendering of Sancho Panza's proverb would be: 'Tell me the books you read and I'll tell you what you are.

Books and reading have been the fruitful and exhaustless theme of countless English essayists, poets and philosophers ever since Bacon wrote, "Reading maketh a full man," and Pope scorned

"The bookful blockhead ignorantly read,  
With loads of learned lumber in his head,"

and the perversely logical Methodist preacher delivered the brilliant commentary: "'A little learning,' says the poet, 'is a dangerous thing.' Ah, then, dear brethren, what must a great deal of it be?" The world long ago got beyond discussing the utility or rather the necessity of reading in general; but successive generations have always continued to publish books about books; and although the question is no longer, now, if it ever was, to read or not to read—there still remain two other questions the answers to which, far from being obvious, are steadily growing more and more difficult of discovery. What to read, and how to read it? Specific answers to either question would necessarily be as varied as are the intellectual requirements and capabilities of the multitudinous readers; but helpful hints are available, both as to books read for the purpose of general mental culture, and as to those in harmony with one's particular profession. Reading undoubtedly occupies a considerable portion of the time at the disposal of most priests, and *ought* to occupy some part of the leisure of all of them; hence a paper dealing with the matter and method of a cleric's reading may reasonably be supposed to appeal to the attention of the younger clergy, even should it fail to command their approbation.

And first, let it be said that the young ecclesiastic who has arrived at the epoch of his ordination without having acquired a taste for good reading, is very sincerely to be pitied; and that the absence of such a taste denotes something radically wrong, either in himself or in the collegiate

training to which he has been subjected. If the classics of his mother-tongue, whether in prose or poetry, are to him mere bowing acquaintances, instead of valued friends; if he cannot appreciate their lofty sublimity, their multiform beauty, or their delicate humor, his mental development has not kept pace with his physical growth. He may have acquired a considerable store of fact-knowledge and a smattering of various sciences, but "so far as reading is concerned his mind is still the mind of the child who reads his book only till he finds out the meaning of the pictures it contains." Volumes that should be to him as pleasant flower gardens, bright with varied colors and redolent of a thousand grateful odors, he looks upon as arid deserts, progress through which would surely prove a wholly uninteresting and toilsome task.

If he reads, at all, anything higher than the sensational fiction which debauches the intellectual system just as opium does the physical one, it is in a desultory fashion, at infrequent intervals, for brief periods, and with scarcely perceptible results. Even a good novel is beyond his mental grasp. Like the emotional young woman, he sees nothing but vapidity in the masterpieces of Thackeray, and turns from them to revel in the puerile pages of Rhoda Broughton or the "Duchess;" if indeed he is not more at home on the still lower intellectual plane whereon the unformed schoolboy takes to his heart the blood-curdling adventures of "Wild Nick of the Gulch," or the absorbing inanities of "Old Sleuth the Detective."

Place such a young man in a city or large town, and the chances are that he will give to the world and its pleasures an undue portion of his time and attention; place him in a remote country parish where during the greater part of the week he has five or six hours of daily leisure at his disposal, and it is hardly too much to say that it will require a superabundance of God's grace to preserve him from moral shipwreck. No one will question the statement that, other things being equal, the priest who has the greatest amount of intellectual resources is in the least danger from inferior

temptations—if for no other reason, because he has fewer idle moments ; and hence a taste for solid reading is to the average man a genuine moral help. “When a man has neither work enough nor study enough to fill his mind,” says Cardinal Manning, “he suffers from monotony, and is restless for change. He is weary of vacancy, and craves for an interest. He finds none at home, and he seeks it abroad. His mind wanders first, and he follows it. His life becomes wasted and dissipated—that is, scattered and squandered, full of weariness and a tediousness in all things, which at last invades even his acts and duties of religion. . . . Weariness is the descending path that leads to sloth, and sloth is the seventh of the sins which kill the soul.”<sup>1</sup>

It need scarcely be remarked in this connection that, while the possession of a good library is *prima facie* evidence of its possessor's taste for good reading, experience proves that such evidence is frequently unreliable. To have a few hundred select volumes is one thing ; to make oneself familiar with their contents is quite another. The taste for making a collection of really valuable books is decidedly more common, among the clergy as among other people, than is the zest for perusing them, once they are collected. A priest possessing any perceptible amount of self-respect must, in deference to the public opinion which affects him personally, have at his disposal a certain number of standard works—those at least that deal with the various branches of ecclesiastical science. In self-defence, if for no other reason, he must own a few fairly well-stocked book shelves ; because he is intimately concerned in keeping up the common—even should it happen to be the erroneous—impression that he is a man of learning and a book-lover.

That hundreds of volumes are purchased in accordance with this principle, rather than from any genuine desire to extract the treasures of wit and wisdom that lie buried in their pages, is a fact as sad as it is incontrovertible. Many a young priest expends, in the first fervor of his ecclesiasti-

<sup>1</sup> The Eternal Priesthood, p. 90.

cal career, the bulk of his available funds in buying goodly tomes which, for all the practical benefit he will ever derive from them, might just as well be reposing on the bookseller's shelves as on his own. A fine library is unquestionably an embellishment to any residence ; but when they are to serve for ornamental purposes only, books are rather a costly acquisition. Not by the books one *has*, but by those he reads, and reads judiciously, is his mental growth affected ; and the untouched and often uncut tomes which make so brave a show in the bookcases of some clerics are less indicative of the intellectual calibre of their owners than are the paper-covered volumes that lie open on desk or table, and accumulate in drawers and closets.

Supposing, however, that the young priest has been discreetly trained to habits of mental discipline, and that he has not vitiated his taste for the valuable in literature by the indiscriminate perusal of literary trash, what should be the nature of the volumes that go to form his library? Obviously he should, at the outset, supplement his seminary text-books with at least one or two standard works on each of the subjects which were the matter of his studies during the three or four years immediately preceding his ordination. Of none of these subjects is his knowledge likely to be more than elementary ; and on most of them he may read during a lifetime with no fear that his time is being unprofitably expended. Theology, whether dogmatic or moral, is an inexhaustible mine wherein he may delve for decades with the certainty of constantly discovering new nuggets of precious truth with which to stock his mental treasury. A volume or two on the liturgy and the rubrics will prove indispensable, not only for purposes of consultation in special emergencies, but for occasional hours of attentive study as well. Comprehensive treatises on Canon Law and the Councils, although perhaps less rigorously necessary than the foregoing, should certainly find a place in his collection and occupy a portion of his leisure. An ecclesiastical history such as that of Rohrbacher or Darras, one or two ascetical works, a few volumes of controversy, a *Thesaurus Patrum*, an exhaust-

ive commentary on the catechism, a full exposition of the Gospels and Epistles, a practical work on sacred eloquence with several collections of sermons and homilies, the "Lives of the Saints," a *Directorium Sacerdotale* and a half-score of volumes for the purpose of meditation and spiritual reading, —these, with God's own book, the Bible, and the quasi-inspired "Imitation of Christ," may properly be considered the nucleus of a cleric's library. They are as the very tools of the priestly trade, and hence are virtually indispensable to such sacerdotal laborers as are desirous of doing good and efficient work.<sup>1</sup>

To the foregoing professional collection additions may well be made from the wide domain of general or profane literature. The sublimest conceptions of human genius, the noblest thoughts of the most highly dowered intellects, the fairest transcripts of the ideal beautiful and good and true, lie forever embalmed between the covers of some half a hundred volumes whose cost will not severely tax even the most moderate income. The masterpieces of the world's poets, philosophers, historians, essayists, biographers, and novelists are, in our day, within the reach of the scantiest purse; and some few of them, at least, should be admitted to the intellectual storehouse of him concerning whom it is written: "*Labia sacerdotis custodient sapientiam.*" The quality of the volumes, rather than their number, is the true criterion by which to estimate the comparative excellence or worthlessness of different book-collections; and a priest may possess a very admirable library although he owns no more than a hundred books. As efficient aids to genuine mental growth and literary culture, indeed, the Bible and Shakespeare are alone worth any thousand other books taken at random from the shelves of a great library; and though a man had no other volumes than these two and a good quarto dictionary, he would still possess, both ample material for the highest development of his intellectual powers, and the

1 As for current or periodical literature, there are few priests who cannot afford to subscribe to several Catholic papers and magazines; and there are none who can afford *not* to subscribe to at least one ecclesiastical publication.

best models for the formation of a literary or an oratorical style.

Apart from the incomparable views of the Sacred Scriptures, as the Word of God, the inspired volume possesses another merit to which a good many priests are apparently blind, or which in any case they do not sufficiently appreciate—that of literary excellence. The man who cannot enjoy reading its pages, considered merely as literature, deriving therefrom a delight akin to that afforded by the poetry of Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth and Tennyson, or the prose of Bacon, Burke, Newman and Ruskin, has a taste less cultured than might reasonably be looked for in one who has enjoyed the educational advantages of the ordinary cleric. “There is no higher poetry on earth than Isaias, no higher prose than the parables of our Lord.” The encomium pronounced a few months ago by a distinguished American editor on the Bible as, of all the books, essential to the journalist, “the most indispensable, the most useful, the one whose knowledge is most effective,” merely attested the editor’s scholarship, although it probably astonished his average auditor. “I am considering it now,” said the lecturer, “not as a religious book, but as a manual of utility, of professional preparation, or professional use for the journalist. There is perhaps no book whose style is more suggestive, more instructive, from which you learn more directly that sublime simplicity which never exaggerates, which recounts the greatest events with solemnity, of course, but without sentimentality or affectation, none which you open with such confidence or lay down with such reverence: there is no book like the Bible.”<sup>1</sup>

The manner of one’s reading is scarcely a less important consideration than is the matter. It is quite possible to read even the best books for four or five hours daily without deriving from the exercise any appreciable profit, or at least a profit at all proportioned to the time expended. If our reading is to prove of real benefit, if it is to build up and

1 Charles A. Dana, in a lecture on “Journalism.”

strengthen the mental fabric and conduce to the healthful development of moral character, it must be accompanied by certain indispensable conditions. One such condition is that it should be methodical. Given a book worth reading for any rational, legitimate purpose, one's best plan is to set apart a fixed period to be given to it each day until its perusal is finished. Habitual desultoriness in reading is not merely unprofitable; it is positively deleterious. Inconstancy of purpose and discursiveness of thought are weeds which in the soil of most minds spring up all too rapidly, and their noxious growth needs repression rather than encouragement. The preacher who is continually wandering away from his text, who can never keep to his subject, whose arguments are loose, disconnected, wanting in logical sequence, is almost invariably a man whose reading has been desultory and aimless.

It is obvious, in the second place, that to render our reading profitable, we must give to the matter read our attentive consideration. "Attention," says Brother Azarias, "is the fundamental condition of all reading, of all study, of all work properly done;" yet it is a condition very often wanting in those who devote even a large part of their leisure to books. To concentrate one's mental faculties upon the author's train of thought, to the utter exclusion of other musings, conceits and fancies, is a habit as necessary to acquire as it is difficult of acquisition. The perfect attention which the trained scholar readily gives to any subject, however dry and uninteresting, is possible to the undisciplined thinker only when the theme is wholly congenial to his tastes, or when it strongly appeals to his interest. Like all other habits, this of attention is formed by the constant repetition of single acts. The reader who resolutely turns away from distractions as soon as he notices their presence, and repeatedly brings his mind back to the consideration of the full meaning of the lines which his eyes are traversing, will eventually acquire facility in concentrating the powers of his intellect on whatsoever subject he will.

Not less necessary than either of the foregoing conditions



is the leisurely meditation of what one has read or is reading. When Bacon wrote that "some few books are to be chewed and digested," he formulated the great law of judiciously using good books; and the main reason why the mass of men derive so little intellectual sustenance from what they read is that, instead of chewing their mental food, they bolt it. If a book possesses for us any utility at all, its worth has not been duly appreciated until by reflection, by comparison, by deliberate judgment, its substance has become thoroughly assimilated to our own intellectual being. Reading that is unproductive of mental activity may serve to *kill* time, but certainly does not improve it. On the whole, if man is intellectually ruminant, the wise cleric is he who, shunning the rank and innutritious among books, seeks only the most succulent literary pasturage, and spends some hours daily both in attentively browsing, and in assiduously chewing the cud.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C. S. C.

---

### THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS.<sup>1</sup>

THE artist aims at perfect expression. He is never satisfied with the execution of his work; it falls short of his ideal. The element of imperfection, always present in things human, fetters the freedom of his footsteps and clips the wings of his flight. He never realizes the fulness of his conception. Criticism, the conscience of art, appreciates and measures the difficulties in the way, and though keeping the ideal in full view, passes judgment with an eye to the possibilities within reach.

I I refrain from any comparison between the Protestant and Catholic press of this country, as the former makes no pretense to cover the wider field that Catholic journalism does. The Protestant press, with two or three notable exceptions, is simply an annex to the Protestant pulpit. It is devoted almost exclusively to Church topics, and, with the exceptions indicated, can make no claim above mediocrity.

When the Catholic press of this country becomes the object of criticism, justice requires us to measure its points, good or bad, by this law of perspective. It should be estimated in proper relation to its times and circumstances. It is far below the ideal, presents many ugly features, and ranks, in the scale of present possibilities, perhaps not up to the average. Its weak points were set forth without extenuation in an admirable article in the February number of this REVIEW. The scale of imperfection was drawn with a free hand, and in the purview of the severe ideal held aloft as the model, grew to discouraging proportions. But it must be remembered that criticism, concentrated upon defects and dropping out of sight the softening lines of the natural perspective behind, brings out the foreground with violent sharpness and blunt obtrusiveness. While admitting the substantial accuracy of Mr. Reilly's strictures, I think that the background, which he failed to indicate, will somewhat soften the severer lines of his critique.

The weak points of the Catholic press are not altogether *per se*. They are in large measure the shadows of its background. As it stands to-day in this country it bears the evident impress of its times and its surroundings. It belongs to the end of this century and draws its sustenance from American soil. The press in America is a unique institution, the efflorescent product of a social soil rank with the corruptions of liberty. So generous is the domain of liberty in the American view that it merges without visible demarcation into the regions of license. Nowhere is this failure to distinguish between the limits more manifest than in the spirit of the American secular press. All things, all men, all occasions, all times are the universal themes of its gigantic confidence. In this infinite extension of its functions, it is simply the reflex of the lax public sentiment that begets and fosters its boldness. Upon that sentiment, like a true parasite, it lives and thrives. Its one aim is to cater to it. Public sentiment does not merely tolerate, but eagerly sustains an unbridled press. When public sentiment changes for the better the *morale* of the press will improve. Ameri-

can journalism is simply the creature of public sentiment, and Caliban serves according to his master's wishes.

Taken in the lump the public press of this country is not a literary, but a commercial enterprise. The newspaper reader is not athirst for pure English; style to him is an unknown quantity. He reads the paper for the news of the day. He has neither leisure nor taste for literary form. On the other hand, the newspaper has neither leisure nor taste to serve him with what he does not want, and what he would not, or could not, appreciate, if, on its part, it were possible to give. News is gathered in a rush, given out in a rush, and read in a rush. It is a hasty pudding for speedy travelers. Literature is the labor of time, patience, leisure, thought. It germinates beneath the soil, out of sight. It sprouts with effort, matures slowly and painfully through many vicissitudes of seasons and weathers. Its flower is the elaboration of innumerable secret forces, ranging from the heart of the sun to the core of the earth. Its blossoms burgeon in time, but its roots are in eternity. No room, therefore, for literature in the surface soil of journalism. The public does not look for literature in the newspapers, notwithstanding the expanded bulk of the Sunday edition—a cheap potpourri in imitation of the magazine. The essential ingredients of the newspaper are news and brief comment in editorial articles, thrown off under pressure of time and dictated by a policy always subservient to the expediencies of the cash box.

I am not criticising, but describing. I have merely limned the farther background of the Catholic press. How do these circumscriptions of the secular press affect it?

It would be surprising if the Catholic press were to escape these vast influences in the solar system of journalism. The titanic power of the secular press is acknowledged on all sides. But, as we have seen, the press is rather the manifestation than the original seat of the force. Public sentiment is in reality the orb whose secret influences governs the flowings and ebbings of these mighty tides. To suppose that Catholic journalism should not be disturbed in some

marked degree from its normal rotation around its own ideal centre by the pull of a force, whose action is so profoundly and universally felt in our social existence, would be the calculation of a momentous problem with an essential factor left out. We cannot criticise the Catholic press fairly nor point accurately in the direction of its improvement until we give measurable allowance to the actual causes of its defection from right lines. We the more readily discover the true path of its proper motion by accounting for the irregularities governing its deviation.

The Catholic paper seeks a clientele amongst a public educated, or degraded if you prefer, to a journalistic standard by secular newspaperism. The American public, under the peculiar social and political conditions of this country, where liberty, especially of speech, thrives in exaggerated proportions, has developed on the one hand that public sentiment of unrestrained free speech, which we see manifesting itself so riotously in the secular press, and, on the other, under the law of reaction, has been morbidly stimulated to a perpetual appetite for this license of utterance by the unruly creature of its own affection. Like all habits begotten of passion, the newspaper appetite grows stronger by what it feeds upon. The Catholic journalist lives under this public condition, and he realizes it. He depends on public favor as his brother of the public press does, for the existence of his paper. It must please or die. The public ear, the ear he seeks to fill, has been long engrossed or corrupted, if you like, by the siren voice of secular journalism. It will listen only to a voice attuned, at least in some degree, to the air and measure of the popular ditty. He must, to some extent, descend to the regions of popular favor. Here is his dilemma. How may he gain the favor he requires and yet not sacrifice the principle he stands for? He is rigidly debarred from catering to that vein of public prurency, where secular journalism strikes its richest ore. Nay, his object is to provide a wholesome antidote to this secular spirit of lubricity. He is actually the rival of secular journalism, bidding for popular patronage where the public

mind is educated along the lines of his powerful competitor's ideals. To meet the exigency he adopts the *form* of the secular journal. As a rule the make-up of the Catholic journal, in subserviency to public popular requirements, is thoroughly secular. Head-lines, double, triple, striking, startling, to catch the eye, to engage the curiosity of the reader, are freely indulged. Its dress is fashioned on the secular model. With few exceptions Catholic journals have the appearance of daily newspapers. They present themselves to their readers as newspapers.

But it is not alone in this respect that they are constrained to follow in the wake of the secular press. They are under the necessity of catering to a public mind that has waxed intellectually lean and lank on a desultory newspaper diet. The general run of newspaper readers, and it must not be forgotten that it is on the general run that the Catholic paper depend, know little of, and care less for, solid mental pabulum. They read hurriedly, at hap-hazard; tasting, not eating. It is the spice and the saucing they seek, not nutrition. Here is a public taste the Catholic editor finds already formed, and apparently invincible. It is not beef and bread, but truffles and sauces the public wants. He must condescend to the palate of his readers. He fills the columns of his paper with articles, light, airy, trifling, striking, amusing, flippant, brief. The instructive in a serious vein, save on especial occasions, he seeks to eschew. It is considered better journalism to banish sustained thought even from the editorial page. Refuge is taken in the squib, pregnant, pungent, sarcastic, humorous if possible. Editorial articles over half a column are considered dull. We are told that people won't read them! One of Mr. Reilly's severest strictures on Catholic journalism is the lack of "competent editors." The ideal editor, called for by Mr. Reilly, "to natural ability for literary work and a thorough college course—including two years of philosophy—should have added a special course of study in theology, Church history, social economy, physical science, education, American history," etc. Such an editor in the mind's eye is a

desideratum. Such an editor actually in harness would be a source of genuine strength and benefit to any journal, but his equipment must be kept carefully out of sight. His erudition and his scholarship should be invisible; foundations, but unseen. Erudition and scholarship are not in the purview of newspaper readers. Philosophy and theology are *toto coelo* the antipodes of their mental habitat, and social science they only know in the thunderous echoes of demagoguery. The ideal editor is needed, but as an invisible force directing and guiding. But even he, to use Mr. Reilly's illustration in quite another application, cannot make the stream rise higher than its source. Well equipped pilot as he may be, he cannot sail his ship in waters higher than the level of public sentiment, which is the source of the journalistic stream he navigates.

Such are the channels publicly marked out for the Catholic press in this country. We discover, as a consequence many lamentable defects in its career. Its general tone is lowered far below the pitch of the exalted ideal we would like to see dominating it. Its literary form is that of the newspaper, no more, no less. These are the marks of a radically unfavorable environment. It finds itself compelled to fulfil the double function of a religious journal and a newspaper. As a religious journal its ideal is exalted, as a newspaper it is constrained by public sentiment to fall into line, in many respects, with the secular press. Its existence depends upon its capacity to cater successfully to that sentiment in channels already worn for it by influences vastly mightier than itself.

Compared with the image of its lofty ideal our Catholic press is, on the whole, a very imperfect figure. The clay of which it is moulded is not perfectly malleable, and no artist, however skilful, can make a perfect statue out of intractable material. Its fashion is largely the fashion of the hour and the place. It is unfair to criticise it apart from the unavoidable conditions of its existence. Public sentiment has been so far estranged from the conception of the Catholic ideal by the perpetual presence of a deformed

model, that Catholic journalism to be tolerated at all by a vitiated public taste is constrained to adapt itself, as far as it can without sacrificing principle, to the unfortunate exigency of the vulgar sentiment pervading the entire journalistic world with rare and particular exceptions.

Consider with its environment, the Catholic press is in responsive keeping with its setting, and its improvement in its many defective points, which in it are largely the effects of that intimate sympathy between a journal and popular taste, will follow only when its clientele are educated up to the ideal to which it aspires as its ultimate perfection. Not to be forgotten however, are the possibility and the consequent duty of the Catholic journalist to push on in the direction of that goal. He can and should lead the Catholic public toward the promised land. This, however, he should do prudently, without forcing violently against untoward circumstances, nor yet yielding to the persistent pressure of that public pruriency, which is the journalist's standing temptation to a rapid and easy success. When the wind of public sentiment sets so strongly against him, blowing away from his goal, not being able in duty to run before it and finding it impossible to make headway dead against it, he must be wise and tack, and while allowing for the contrary gale, use it, like a skilful pilot, to bring his vessel by slow degrees into port. No man should keep his eye steadier on his ideal as his pilot star, yet no man needs more to make ample allowance for the force of the winds and currents of public opinion.

No man should be more independent of the temptation and the power of money, and yet no man needs more to make friends of the Mammon of iniquity. He must lead, yet must he follow. He must be ideal, yet practical. The moment he loses sight of his ideal, he degenerates. The moment he loses sight of the practical, he fails.

So far we have considered only those factors in the environment which force the Catholic journalist to consider and appease popular sentiment. But there is a vastly larger region in the popular conception of journalism where he may

not venture. When he oversteps that limit he forfeits his right and title to Catholic. It goes without saying that he is forever and absolutely barred from the territory of lubricity and its cognate sensationalism. The Stympalian lake is the proper abode of the Harpies. Neither gods nor men may dwell by its fetid shores. But there is a field of riot, whose limits should be adamantine barriers to the Catholic editor, though secular journalists daily make familiar breaches in them. Free speech has become an American habit, but it is a habit of unstable quality, as often degenerating into vice as holding to the path of virtue. So lax is the public estimate of what constitutes freedom of speech that legal libel has come to be regarded as the sole restraining limit of utterance, and this only by virtue of the penalty of the positive law. How vast the range of verbal license within this almost indefinite stretch finds ample illustration in the diurnal boldness of the American press.

It is needless to say that, however tempting or provoking the occasion, the Catholic editor has no license to range these lawless pastures. What then positively marks the limits of his journalistic area? The answer depends upon the answer to a further question: What is the Catholic journal? It is first and last a religious journal. *Noblesse oblige*. The irreligious, the irreverent, the immoral, the indifferent in substance or in speech, indirect or implied, are its primary incompatibles. This much on merely negative lines: each and all of these are essentially repugnant to it; they are what it never can be without ceasing to be what it professes to be essentially. On positive lines the Catholic journal is the organ of all that body of doctrines, of morals and of discipline, which the Catholic Church believes, teaches, commands and ordains. To stand as the enlightened exponent of all this before the world is its foremost office. Catholic teaching, doctrinal and disciplinary, is the premise of its discourse and the principle of its conduct. It has no shadow of a title to deviate a hair's breadth from this open highway. The line of its march is marked out with broad accuracy, and if it swerve to the right or the left beyond



these generous limits it abandons its claim to service. The vagaries of that unguarded liberty and of that bold caprice, which so easily transform liberty into license,

ut turpiter atrum

Desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne,

are neither for it nor of it.

Up to this point there can be no room to doubt the wide restrictions of the Catholic journal. Within the lines described, its range is defined with unmistakable margins. But we are looking for some more immediate principle of direction than the general duty of loyalty to the cause which the Catholic editor defends, some proximate rule of guidance easy of apprehension and application.

The keystone of Catholic doctrine and discipline is authority divinely founded. Throughout the world the Bishops of the Church are vested with that authority in their divers sees, since they are the teachers ordained of God to instruct and guide the faithful. Each Bishop is pastor of his respective flock, over which he exercises plenary jurisdiction. Obedience to his Ordinary in matters doctrinal, moral and canonical is the first duty of the Catholic. In this we have a sure and practical guide to the Catholic editor. He can never be independent of the obedience due to the Ordinary in whose diocese his paper is published. Obedience is the bond of rule and rule the security of order. The Catholic journal can only presume to instruct, teach and guide subject to its Ordinary. It possesses no authority of its own and undertakes its mission under no divine seal. Its service is purely volunteer, and of its own motion it can make no claim on the faith and the allegiance of the Catholic public. If it have not the approval of its Ordinary, expressed or implied, it can make no legitimate claim to be a Catholic paper. If it should ever be unfortunate enough to come in conflict with its Ordinary, obedience is the peremptory duty of its editor, even though he be honestly convinced of the rectitude of his cause; and if it be just, nothing will shear it of its virtue so effectively as contumacy. The first sign—

an infallible sign—of the integrity of a Catholic journal is prompt, unreserved and open submission to the command of its Ordinary. Reluctant, indirect, evasive compliance is but smothered rebellion. An appeal to that spirit of barbaric independence, which holds authority and, by consequence, order in contumely, is so gross an offense against the Catholic instinct, so brutal an outrage on Catholic loyalty as to place the Catholic editor, guilty of the heinous folly, irrevocably beyond the pale. The mask of American free speech, assumed in such a case, could never conceal the features of anarchy lurking behind it.<sup>1</sup>

Not less reprehensible in the Catholic editor would be the hypocritical pretense of upholding higher authority while denying or holding light the authority of his own Ordinary, an instance which I put in the hypothetical, yet not so far from the categorical as to have been always and readily distinguishable. An ardently jealous regard for the authority of the Holy See, assumed as a panoply of defense or aggression in conflict with the jurisdiction of the Ordinary, is simply a foul and traitorous attempt to divide the house against itself, for authority in the Church is as much one as doctrine. Obedience to the authority of the Ordinary is a cardinal principle and a prime solicitude of the Holy See, and Rome turns with aversion from the cause, which even though just, begins an irregular and incongruous defense by rebellion and contumacy. To smite authority in America is to wound it at Rome, and the Catholic, hypothetical Catholic at least, who holds the authority of his Ordinary in contempt will have as little real respect for the supreme authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, for authority everywhere rests on the same principle. It is as if a subaltern in a division of the army serving in a distant country should deny and defy the authority of his general on the presumption that he is the self-constituted guardian and defender of the authority of the commander-in-chief a thousand miles away. Military regu-

<sup>1</sup> Leo XIII. *Epistola ad Arch. Parisien. De omnium erga pontificem debita obedientia.* 17 June, 1888.

lations, the requirements of discipline, would make short shrift of this valorous champion of an authority he gratuitously assumes to protect against itself.

Obedience, therefore, to his own Ordinary is the first rule of the Catholic editor. What then should be the formal relation between the Ordinary and the Catholic journal? Should not the Catholic journal be an official organ? Would not such a connection give dignity, standing, solidity, force to the Catholic journal?

The Catholic press is a volunteer service. It is no part of the regular corps of the Church. To make the Catholic journal official would change its character. As volunteer it enjoys a freedom which enables it to move with facility over the entire field of its proper functions. It knows no restriction, save the lines determined by its own essential character, is hampered by no fretful limits of personal idiosyncracies on the part of the Ordinary, is absolutely free in the region of mere opinion, and can therefore speak out without fear of rebuke or of disfavor, and is secure from the disastrous result of theoretical direction. On the other hand, as official organ it becomes simply the mouthpiece of the Bishop—a mere printed vicar-general. It would lack spontaneity, grow timidly conservative, morbidly cautious—in short, become the shadow of a Bishop afraid of his own shadow. The reason is evident; the responsibility of the Bishop can never be delegated. The editor of an official organ can never speak first hand; his utterances are in reality the Bishop's. No Bishop would or could be willing to put himself unreservedly in the hands of another. Now the exigencies of modern journalism demand an expression of opinion or of conviction upon every imaginable subject that arises. There is no subject in these modern days beyond the wise or unwise comment of the editor. A Bishop, by virtue of the exalted dignity and wide responsibilities of his office is not prepared to give such universal expression to every topic under the sun. The responsibility would be intolerable. But such responsibility does rest upon the shoulders of any Ordinary, who makes the Catholic journal official. Its every utterance is validly

put down to his account. A Catholic journal so conducted would be cramped to the minimum of usefulness, and its Ordinary in constant hazard of being made to say what his official character would render imprudent or even detrimental to the interests of religion. As an instance: questions of a political complexion are often of vital concern to religion. A Bishop from prudential reasons of an official nature is constrained to avoid the subject. A Catholic editor on the contrary, is obligated to speak, and that often emphatically, or jeopardize the cause he is defending. An official organ on such occasion is bound to silence, because its Ordinary cannot speak. So far from acquiring standing or force from such a connection, the official journal would find itself weakened. Its dignity, its standing and force must come from its own intrinsic merit. Its reputation must be its own. Borrowed plumage does not make fine birds.

No hierarchy in the world appreciates the value of an unofficial press more than our American Bishops. No hierarchy more generously meets the bounds of journalistic liberty. We have yet to hear of the American Bishop who ever arbitrarily clipped the wings of Catholic journalism or chained the Catholic editor to the episcopal door-mat. There could be no better evidence of the large liberty allowed Catholic journalism by the American hierarchy, than the variant attitudes of Catholic journals in this country during the recent school controversy. It seemed to us a dangerous generosity under a most galling provocation, when the episcopal dignity was more than frequently assailed, and its authority arrogantly called in question by embittered controversialists. Outside of these irregularities, tolerated, I presume, for the sake of the principle involved and the peculiar conditions under which the issue was introduced, the question was an open one. The Catholic press could not have maintained silence in face of the public and national character of the issue, albeit, it was bound to treat it with due consideration and regard for all interests concerned. The hierarchy recognized an untoward situation and suffered a wider margin of liberty than even charity required. At the same time had any

Ordinary commanded silence on the part of the Catholic journal or journals published in his own diocese, the Catholic editor, however uncalled for he may have felt the restriction, would have been obligated to obey. To his own Ordinary he owes immediate and unquestioning obedience.

A cognate question here suggests itself. Does the Catholic editor owe the same implicit obedience to a Bishop not his Ordinary? While the answer is clearly in the negative, for the reason that his own Ordinary alone has jurisdiction, there can be no question but that he owes the utmost deference and respect to every Bishop in the country by virtue of the dignity of the episcopal office. Nor is he at liberty to slight, flout or hold in contempt the person of other Bishops or the acts of their administration within their respective sees. If the restraint of his own sense of loyalty is not sufficient for him the Council of Baltimore has legislated against such critical encroachments by the Catholic press.

To conclude: the independence of the Catholic Press is not conterminous with the lax liberties of secular journalism. It is limited by its essential character as religious generally and Catholic specifically. The Catholic editor wears a uniform and serves under a banner, albeit his is a volunteer service. The authority of his Ordinary is his safeguard and the immediate rule of his conduct. If he would accomplish the maximum of good he must be in perfect accord with that authority. If his journal would achieve only the minimum of good, it will find these limits as soon as it becomes an official organ. Such restrictions would strike the editor's most effective weapons out of his hands. To the hierarchy in general and the clergy he owes a loyal deference and respect. Their good name and dignity he must cherish and guard jealously. Above all—need it be said?—the interests of the Holy See are not only his duty but his special privilege to publicly guard and defend, and foremost among these interests the cause of Temporal Power of the Sovereign Pontiffs. This especially, as a Catholic publicist, he is not free to ignore or neglect, since the Holy Father himself has called upon all Catholic writers to publish and defend the

justice of his cause before the world. The Catholic editor who keeps loyally within these lines, and their confines are ample for the exercise of the most vivacious independence or of the most exalted capacity, will never run foul of his own duty or find his liberty crippled; nor will his Ordinary ever have occasion to curb his zeal with the strong bit of authority. There is no Bishop in the United States but loathes to abridge the liberty of the Catholic press; not one but prefers to suffer an occasional mistake made with good intent in a good cause than to see it gyved in a timorous and fruitless conservatism.

On the whole the Catholic press will improve as the American public becomes educated to better ideals of journalism. So much for the general promise of advance. But there is one practical measure that could be taken without waiting for this general improvement in public appreciation, to materially strengthen the Catholic press, and that is, the limitation of the number of Catholic journals. One journal in each archdiocese or at least at each great Catholic centre, would be ample provision. Catholic patronage is largely wasted by the support of numbers of journals that fulfil their functions but indifferently with the means they command. If these means, which they thus divert from the larger and more influential journals, could be put into the service of the latter, Catholic journalism as a whole could take an auspicious stride forward. Here is the first step in the way of advance. How it is to be accomplished is a question for consideration. The initiative could come gracefully and propitiously from the hierarchy. I venture this suggestion in the hope that it may bear fruit.

CONDÉ B. PALLÉN.

**PARTISAN POLITICS IN THE CATHOLIC PRESS.**

THE present position of the Catholic press in this country closely resembles Mr. Micawber's chronic condition—a waiting for something to turn up. Stagnation everywhere, failure too frequent, enterprise as vacuous as beating the air—these are strong features in the daily history of the popular weekly press, which represents the Catholic body in the field of journalism. Clever men and women are devoting much time and thought to its development. It is not entirely their fault if thus far success has played will-o'-the-wisp to their ambition. To become powerful and prosperous a press must have readers. As a rule Catholics do not read the Catholic weeklies, even where they buy or subscribe for them. Hence criticism of the Catholic weekly press must be tempered with sympathy for its condition. I think it ought not to be criticized at all, until priests and people have first felt the lash for their curious and fatal indifference to the greatest moulder of passing public opinion the world has ever seen. Indifference, perhaps, is not a strong enough word. Conciliar decrees, episcopal letters, and pulpit recommendations have steadily favored the Catholic press, resulting in no change for the better; the reason being that few feel the real necessity and comprehensive usefulness of a capable press, while the many remain in ignorance or apathy. This indifference is responsible for the bloodless condition of our press, and incidentally for that indulgence in partisan politics, which has disgraced and destroyed many journals, and limited the influence of all.

Catholic journals are for the most part devoted to the Democratic party, showing their partisanship in various degrees of intensity. Those conducted upon honest principles and decent methods are partisan the year round, and stand to their party through all weathers: the unprincipled—more numerous than one would believe—are violent partisans at election time, in proportion to the moneys doled out to them by the party and its candidates. Of these there need be no word here except utter condemnation. Venal to the last degree, their proper place is with the other hucksters

in the temple, whose sole distinction it is to be occasionally lashed by the Christ. For the honestly partisan paper there is an adequate reason: the majority of English-speaking Catholics belong to the Democratic party, they like to mix their politics with their religion, and their favorite journals must cater to this taste. The question for practical discussion is: what concern have partisan politics with the Catholic press; and how far do they increase or diminish its effectiveness?

In my opinion, the aims, the duties, the responsibilities of the Catholic press must shut out partisan politics from its columns, no matter how pure and lofty may be the motives of editors. As the representative of the Catholic body in the world of journalism, how can it faithfully represent a body which knows no partisanship in matters political, since it considers only the general good, and touches politics only from that standpoint? How can it speak with authority, with effect, to each individual, when one-third or one-half the multitude addressed is suspicious of its sincerity and ability in political matters, or denies its influence and authority altogether in this concern? The partisan journal must support its party under all circumstances; it can denounce evil measures and projects, of course, but errors and blunders which affect the people seriously, must be passed over, the merits of opposition measures and leaders must remain unmentioned where they reflect on the party; figures and facts that tell for the opposition, though highly beneficial to the nation, must be suppressed; and the minority of its Catholic readers must patiently bear with a hundred other offences, direct and indirect, against their cherished political convictions and prejudices. In fact, only the most philosophical members of such a minority could read the partisan Catholic journal. To cite a concrete instance, no Catholic of the Republican party could read with equanimity and pleasure the *Boston Pilot*, whose partisanship is of the most disinterested sort, yet whose partisan pleas for Democracy enrage the opposition.

Therefore, the influence of the partisan journal is limited



in one direction. Its partisanship may strengthen that influence in another direction, among Catholics of the same political faith, but the compensation has always seemed to me quite inadequate. The aim of the Catholic weekly is to represent the Catholic body. In this respect the partisan weekly falls short of the mark. It can be said that this deficiency is made up by the existence of journals representing all political parties; if one cannot read the *Pilot*, let him read the *Tablet*. In this answer is contained another very strong argument against the partisan journal.

Is there to be no end to partisanship in the press? Have we not enough of it in the secular dailies? Among the two score weeklies and dailies published in New York city, not one will give a reading man an unpartisan view of the great questions affecting the nation's life and progress unless these have no connection with the politics of the moment. Partisanship is carried to the extreme of dishonesty. The financial existence of the secular journals, with few exceptions, depends upon this partisanship. Are we to have no refuge from it, no breathing-place to which we can fly from the turmoil of controversy for undistorted truth, fact, and figure? I speak for the common people who have no time, no training, to study the reviews and make their own conclusions. Is there to be no judge between these struggling and vote-seeking pleaders? None, if the religious, or better, the Catholic press, is to figure, no matter how decorously and honestly, in the promotion of partisanship. The very prevalence of the partisan spirit in the powerful, money-making, party-making, secular press is a strong negative argument for the utter abandonment of partisan politics by Catholic journals.

The positive argument in favor of non-partisanship is the amount of work to be done and good to be wrought—work that *must* be done, good that *must* be wrought—in teaching the multitude how to get a clear, intelligent, useful, unbiassed understanding of our national life, all its important elements, all its stirring questions; in warning them of the errors so often contained in popular legislation; in exposing

the tricks, the false teachings, the rotten character of demagogues; in publishing wide the wrongs inflicted on the poor workers so remote from centres, so beneath public notice, that neither labor-reformer nor secular press can notice them; in holding up for praise the noble men of any party, whose deeds and services entitle them to national recognition. What common man of Democratic faith ever hears of the merits, the labors, the high character of Republican statesmen? What means are ever used to convince the Republican workman, that the tariff, which he places next to the Gospel in dignity and power, can easily be made the tax which doubles the stupendous income of the employer and reduces the worker to starvation? The principle of the famous Force Bill was advocated sincerely and loyally by Republican citizens as a party measure, when it could have been used against their liberties at election time by unscrupulous Democratic leaders. They did not see the danger. What journal, Catholic or secular, is to-day warning the labor parties of the injustice contained in some of their methods, the fatal errors in many of their economic principles, the bad character and weak leadership of certain of their chiefs? None, except the few whose warnings fall on scornful or heedless ears.

The multitude is partisan, too, and takes no advice from political opponents. In truth, if the work which only a non-partisan Catholic journal can do for the Catholic body, the work which lies quite neglected at the door of our Catholic journalists, were properly taken up, there would be no time for partisan politics. The space now wasted on political epigrams, satire, witticisms, dithyramb and editorial would be filled with food for men's souls, not for their political passions—with matter for serious meditation, not for vacuous discussion. If it be said that a high-class journal can do all that has been here indicated, yet remain partisan, the reply must stand undisputed, that its political opponents will never admit its conclusions, even if they go so far as to read it at all.

Not the least evil which has sprung from partisanship in

our Catholic papers is the invasion of this bad spirit into all forms of discussion. How many of our weeklies can discourse upon the merits of a person or a measure with calmness and courtesy? For the average editor a controversy with the world at large or his neighbor in particular is life, inspiration, everlasting delight. Fluency is born of the chance for vituperation. The dry editorial page, whose thought trickled long feebly over baked stones, becomes a torrent on whose raging surface float wonderful and strange-scented terms. Prelate, priest, age, service, virtue, helplessness are attacked with partisan freedom and ferocity. All things are fair in war. The opponent and his argument are kicked with equal foot. Tumult is a peaceful word to describe the riot and uproar one sensitive question can stir up in the editorial pages of the Catholic press. Long connection with the flamboyant partisanship of election times has so blunted feeling, that the trombones of political controversy are used in the sanctuary.

I am of opinion that the Catholic press would of itself become non-partisan did the people take a legitimate interest in its welfare. It would pay to be then non-partisan, as now it pays to cultivate partisanship. But so poorly supported, so lightly esteemed, so completely ignored and misunderstood is the popular weekly press, that publishers and writers must resort to as many shifts as Micawber to keep "the ruins of a falling tower," as Dickens' creation named himself, from coming to the ground altogether. Striving for ideals is out of the question when three meals a day remain an uncertain quantity. Just how far our popular press is from the standard demand by the times can be seen by an examination of the dollar and two dollar weeklies sent out by secular publishers. Here is the weekly *Sun* for instance: eight pages, six columns of advertisements, fifty of reading matter, divided into news, editorials, book reviews, poetry, fiction, and miscellany of the best quality,—the world of last week in a nutshell—done by the best writers at the highest prices: subscription rate, one dollar. Here is the first-class story-paper which has made its owner a millionaire with the aid

of a hundred thousand Catholic readers: sixteen pages, illustrated, fifty columns of reading matter as varied and strong in its way as that in the *Sun*, the work of the best writers, all paid for: subscription rate, two dollars. Put beside these what may be considered the best Catholic weekly on the Continent, and hang your head in shame and despair: stale news clipped from foreign and native exchanges; local news, all names, contributed mostly by amateur reporters; poetry from Byron and Jones of Jersey; a serial story of a generation back, without its dead author's name; a three-dollar letter from no-man's land; a few decently prepared departments, but no book reviews outside of short, incompetent notices; a respectable editorial page as such pages go in a Catholic journal—the only paid work in the paper, and poorly paid at that. Lay it aside reverently in silence, for the shame is not the editor's; it belongs to the Catholic body, which has worn it like a cloak of ample fold, needlessly and with cheerful indifference, for thirty years.

I say needlessly, because the standard of weekly journalism was set up shortly after the war, and could have been adopted by the Catholic body then as easily as it may adopt it next century. That standard can be attained, as we see it in the live weeklies of the time, by our people. It<sup>™</sup> calls for elements which we have in plenty; capable management, financial, editorial, literary, first of all; varied contributions from the best writers of the day in every department of literary and scientific labor; directed by a journalistic intelligence so true and trained that every good work of man and society will receive attention, appreciation, aid. We have the managers, journalists, poets, novelists and scientists necessary to maintain the pioneers in establishing the standard. We need only conviction, living, red-hot conviction, on the part of the leaders, that such a press is necessary and feasible. Lacking that—and I defy any theorist<sup>‡</sup> to prove that it exists in the Catholic body, in priests or people—we lack everything! I am often asked by interested or moneyed men if such journals could be made to pay. I answer here

that there is a mint of money in the enterprise for shrewd investors : but men prefer to invest in wildcat mines, because money has been made in *some* mines, rather than in a Catholic popular press, out of which money has never been known to come. Small blame to the investors ! Though very little money has ever been put into such enterprises, they have seen journal after journal go to the wall, have heard the wails of those whose fingers were burned in Catholic journalism ; but they never saw the foolishness, the ignorance, the conceit, the incompetency, with which these bankrupts rushed in where the angels of the press tread with circumspection and humility. It is well known to business men that only experts can make a newspaper pay. It is just as well known to the same class that anyone can run a Catholic paper !—into the ground, I may add. The failures, where money was plentiful, were due entirely to conceit and incompetency. Given the common factors of any money-making business enterprise, and a Catholic weekly journal can be made an absolute success. It is because these factors have never been present simultaneously that our journals decay and die, or become venal, morose, insipid ; escaping these misfortunes, they surrender themselves to the demon of partisanship in politics.

JOHN TALBOT SMITH.

---

#### THE NEED OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

**M**R. L. W. REILLY'S paper on the weak points of the Catholic press, printed in the February number of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW shows conviction, experience and acute observation. He makes it evident that he desires, above all, that the weak points may be made to disappear and that our press may reach the ideal which many of us believe to be possible.

There are two opinions as to the need of a Catholic press.

There are folk of high standing among us who answer, parodying either Dr. Johnson or Tallyrand, "we don't see the necessity," when the value of the Catholic press is insisted on. These are the people who hold one set of opinions in public and another in private on this subject. It is plain that we are by no means a unit here. This fact must be admitted and considered, as it accounts in part for some of the intermittent support and perfunctory payments of which editors complain. Men who edit or who have edited Catholic papers often forget that the taking of a Catholic paper is not a corollary of Dogma. This lapse of memory amounts to a hallucination with us, and it has been known to make us a trifle querulous. We are not and never have been under any obligations to give all we have to the poor or delinquent subscriber. If we choose to make such a sacrifice God will doubtless reward us; the knowledge that we deserve reward ought not to lead us to expect it from the subscriber except on a purely business basis.

With Mr. Reilly, I admit that there is no Catholic paper in the United States that may be classed with *The Independent*. At the same time I should like to be sure that a paper of the class of *The Independent* would pay before expressing regret that we have not such a paper.

A paper can give no adequate reasons for its existence nor can it exist influentially until it pays or has a good prospect of paying a fair return on the money invested. The question is of demand and supply. I doubt whether the Rev. Wm. Ward Hayes, who has made *The Independent* what it is, with the assistance of a large capital, would be in a position to make the brilliant paper he gives us every week, if *The Independent* ceased to "pay." I hope I may be pardoned for the use of this shockingly commercial word, but a Catholic editor learns by experience that the commercial side of his calling must force itself upon him. If a Catholic paper of the class of *The Independent* could be made to pay we should have it. There is hardly a rich Jew or an infidel in the country who would not be delighted to give Mr. James Jeffrey Roche or Mr. L. W. Reilly all the capital necessary

for such a paper, if either of them could guarantee nine per cent. on the investment. We have Catholic papers that pay contributors and who give their readers all their readers demand; but they do not do things after *The Independent* manner. One reason is that their readers do not demand it of them. Speaking from the point of view of a contributor to the Catholic press as Mr. Reilly has done I may say that I have had as much money for a sonnet from the *Boston Pilot* as from *The Independent*, and if the readers of the *Pilot* would demand much verse, I am sure Mr. Roche would undertake to supply it; and no doubt he would on a similar demand give his readers a paper of the class of *The Independent*, which most of us seem to regard as an excellent paper. The question is, would it pay in Boston and in the great section reached by the *Pilot*?

As I have often been asked to give my opinion very frankly on the subject of the Catholic press, it is only fair that I should show the credentials which permit me to speak with an appearance of authority. I have at various times been the editor of *McGee's Weekly*, the sub-editor of *The Catholic Review* and *The Illustrated Catholic American* and the associate editor (later the editor) of *The New York Freeman's Journal*. My experience outside of these papers has been largely with the secular editors and periodicals, so that I think I am in a position to make comparisons, some of which I shall keep to myself.

The weak points in the Catholic press are lack of capital and a false premise that a religious paper must keep itself apart from the every-day life and thought of the people, that it must be an ecclesiastical organ, with a cylinder set in and arranged to play certain tunes composed without regard to the tastes of people who are not compelled to listen to them. Some of the proprietors of Catholic newspapers—I do not speak of the editors, who are generally men of ability hired at a clerk's wages to grind out the set tunes—fail to remember that their score is not like the Gregorian chant, music which we must listen to whether we like it or not on certain occasions. If one does not care for the tunes of the Catholic

papers of one's diocese, there is an easy way of stopping them : and no number of appeals on the editorial page for payment in advance can oblige a man to part with his money. The Ordinary of the diocese may say that the quality of music discoursed by the organ is exquisite ; but that is a question of taste ; the possible subscriber says, " unless the editor's tunes please my wife or my children or my guests or myself there is no reason under heaven why I should have His Grace's phonograph in my house. I can't have St. Paul or St. Francis de Sales or Thomas a' Kempis or Cardinal Newman for Sunday reading, and the tunes or the polkas and waltzes of the daily press whenever I want them." This is the position, brutally expressed, of the average Catholic.

If the days of bigotry were mercifully to return it would give the Catholic press a great lift. If the daily papers were to close their columns against the *mandements* of our own prelates and the accounts of church celebrations, what a blessing it would be for the editors of our papers ! Many a time I almost prayed that the genial editor of *The New York Sun* might turn into a second Nero ! And the editor of *The Herald* a Julian, so that all the religious " scoops " might come my way ! But Mr. Charles A. Dana still remains the most catholic of men, and there is even a horrible rumor that James Gordon Bennett is " getting religion," so for some time the stalwart Catholics in New York will prefer two lines in *The Sun* to twenty-five in *The Catholic Review* or *The Catholic News*.

If, too, the majority of Catholics had continued to read of the condition and the politics of Ireland in preference to other and more important things, the Catholic editor would have a constituency which he could hold without an effort. Those were sweet days, " sweet as remembered kisses after death," when a three column leader on home rule and one of Father Burke's sermons and six columns of Irish news from the *Dublin Freeman's Journal* made the weekly issue. And before going to Coney Island for the afternoon one had only to add spice to the arrangement by " pitching into " the first esteemed contemporary that came-



to hand! This can not be done now. The Catholic pressman is in competition with the world. He cannot appeal to the Irish national spirit or the kind of piety which will induce a man to pay for a thin tract when he can buy a book by a great doctor in divinity for the same money. He must gain the good will and the interest of wide-awake people who are alive to all the electric currents of the day and who hold that a Catholic paper in the household is "a perpetual mission" only when their children can be led to read it.

The appeals for subscriptions that we editors used to make were much in this form: "I can not give you a very good paper, although you will be obliged to pay me three dollars a year in advance; but, in time, if I can afford it after you have paid your subscriptions, you shall have the worth of your money; of course not this year, but next."

A shoemaker who would begin business in this way would be ruined in advance! And that shoemaker who gave us what we did not want and then complained because we gave it back, would be looked on, from the business point of view, as insane. The shoemaker, however, would have done just what many owners of Catholic journals do continually.

If a paper is to represent the views of a prelate in matters outside of those which every Catholic editor should take in strict duty from the Ordinary of his diocese it ought to be subsidized. Otherwise a subsidy will not help it at all. A paper can never inspire confidence until it pays. A subsidized paper will never take care of itself. If you begin to feed it on pap after the first year it will not earn enough as it grows older to keep itself. The first year of a Catholic paper is generally its easiest. People believe in its promises and there is the pap of the stockholders who generally think that it is only necessary to "hire" a man and to set the presses going. During the second year the amount subscribed by the stockholders, a fabulous amount in their eyes but small in the eyes of the pressman, disappears. There is a panic and the paper takes refuge in patent insides; and perhaps a cheaper editor is engaged. Finally it falls into the hands of a deserving ex-sexton who does what he can with

the advertisements, and alternately pleads with and threatens his subscribers. There are several Catholic papers just at present undergoing this process. The ideal relationship between a Catholic editor and his Ordinary was once described by John Boyle O'Reilly. "Theology," he said, "it doesn't trouble me at all. I stick to the little catechism. If I make a mistake the Archbishop tells me so; I don't make an act of contrition, but I do make satisfaction as soon as I get a chance." The relationship between a Bishop and an editor can easily be arranged by faith, common sense and tact, which every Catholic editor must possess, or perish. A Catholic newspaper at variance with the Ordinary of its diocese is an anomaly and anachronism. If it exist it ought to be printed in the Latin tongue. At the same time a paper which represents only the opinions of the Ordinary on all subjects has no reason at all to exist.

In my experience no paper has been killed by the undue influence of the Ordinary of the diocese or by his neglect. The most common cause for the constant convalescence of Catholic papers is lack of capital and of good business management. Capital will be of no use unless well managed. It must be handled so as to produce a profit. Until the managers of our press look on it from a business point of view it cannot be made thoroughly efficient. That paper which is true to the teachings of the Church, which strengthens, consoles, stimulates, and, by all means, cheers and amuses its readers and pays at least five per cent. on the amount invested, is the successful paper. The last requisite is both the base and the capital of the pillar.

A man may write like St. Paul or put pictures in his paper worthy of St. Luke, but if he has not capital enough to help him through the "dry" season, July, August and September, he is lost. Besides, no paper can depend entirely on its editorials. McMaster's did; but his was always a personal organ. It died with him; it represented him and it can scarcely be looked on as a standard of comparison; he despised business details, and its difficulties were due to this quality in the character of a man of great genius. As Mr.

L. W. Reilly has said in his paper, Mr. P. V. Hickey was admirably equipped. He was devout, reverential, learned and prudent: he had acquired a knowledge of journalism on *The World* under the most versatile of journalists, Mr. Hurlbert. He had a brilliant staff in the beginning, among whom were Mrs. Elizabeth Gilbert Martin, the princess of paragraph writers; Girard, then of *The Graphic*, and John MacCarthy. He knew how to make a good paper and he did it. His plans were sanguine; capital failed, and he was in the heat of the struggle when he died. Without impertinence, I think I may say that all *The Catholic Review* needs to-day is money.

In the first place an editor is necessary. He need not be a man of reputation; and prudence is generally an overrated quality. An editor who must make his paper pay from five to seven per cent. will never be very imprudent. The man who owns an interest in a horse does not ride him to death; but the man who is engaged to ride him from year to year, is not so careful. An editor who will be permanent is necessary. But this editor must have funds at his command for contributors. An editor should not write too much; it is his business to make others touch on the right things. He must see that in every issue of his paper there is sufficient material to interest all of his subscribers,—men, women, and children. If you interest the ladies you are safe, and a man will think twice before he stops a paper in which the women of his house are interested. And you can not successfully print a paper for men,—unless it be a political paper near the election time. Faded receipts for the household will not do. The sole editor of a paper makes a mistake if he puts the family interest below his great editorial utterances. I have tried it myself. Once when *The Freeman's Journal* felt it could not afford to pay a "lady help" for the household department, a receipt for snow pudding turned out to be soft soap. An expert ought to be paid to manage the agricultural column, too, if there be one. Farmers in Maine do not care for instruction as to the spring crops taken from a Louisiana paper, and *The Freeman's Journal* would not have

been threatened with a lawsuit, if the hens of the man near Syracuse had not died because of the authoritative *formulae* printed, with the intention of making them lay during the season when eggs are dear. Nor can a good Roman correspondent be attained without money; nor novelists,—for some day Lady Georgianna Fullerton and Mrs. Craven and Miss Mulholland's stories which have been used over and over again will be utterly thread-bare, though as beautiful as ever. Again, the ideal editor ought to be a man of experience and he ought to be well informed. Brilliant writing is a delightful ornament to an editorial column, but accurate information is better. The ideal editor ought to know people, to be sensitive to coming changes; and, above all, he should not be a partisan in any narrow sense;—because partisans, while they seldom lie, see things from their own point of view only: consequently they seldom tell the truth. Now an editor of this sort must live decently, as Mr. Reilly insinuates. In a city like New York particularly, no editor can be really effective unless he is "in the swim" in a great many ways. He can not be recluse: he must know what is going on in every direction. A man who can do this can not sit at "good men's feasts" without returning the compliment to his host though I do not think—in spite of Mr. Reilly's implications—that the extent of a man's legibility as a dinner guest is gauged by his bank account. There is generally a seat everywhere for a clever editor who wears a good coat, yet the matter of social position is often complicated by the self-respect of the editor. Now a man with these qualifications need not go a-begging: he must be paid and paid well.

Then there is the local staff. You must have well trained men. Quite as important is the business manager. When we remember what the advertisements mean to a paper, it is not necessary to accentuate the value of a competent manager. An editor, too, must have a good fund for contributors. The market is so large for good "copy" and Catholics are so clever, that there is not any of them who feel *obliged* to take one-fourth the price of the copy they furnish for the secular press. Again the demand for "copy" on Catholic subjects.

has so much increased in the office of the Sunday editions of great daily papers, that many of our Catholic journals are content to take it at second-hand, with credit, of course. This is because the paper can not afford to pay for it.

I am not as pessimistic as Mr. L. W. Reilly, whose experience in Catholic journalism has been as great, if not wider than mine. There is no better paper, for its purpose, for instance than Mr. Desmond's *Catholic Citizen* or Mr. Conde Pallen's *Church Progress*. But neither of them claims to be a national organ of the class of *The Independent*. They are both local journals. There are only four cities in this country from which a great national journal could be published, and these are Washington, New York, Chicago, or San Francisco. Given a broad-minded man, familiar with the needs of the country and a sufficient capital, the ideal Catholic paper can be started. It will come in time and around it will perhaps form that great publishing concern that has been dreamed of, and which Lawrence Kehoe did not build up only because he was twenty-five years in advance of his time. Without this great instrument of expression on all topics, we shall always be looked on as second rate. Every time a Catholic newspaper, worthy of the name, complains of non-support, it corroborates the calumny that our people are indifferent to literature when not positively illiterate. The truth is, that Catholic papers are not supported, because they have not the money to *buy* the proper means of support. What made *The Century Magazine*, of which I have the honor to know something? Genius and capital;—but genius would have been powerless without capital. What has made the *New York Sun*? Mr. Dana, and plenty of money. The Archangel Michael, were he reduced to use merely human means, and blessed with a pen of fire, could not conduct a Catholic paper better than the Catholic editor, who has to build brick walls without the mortar,—which is money.

## THE CATHOLIC PRESS AND EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY.

SOME time ago the REVIEW published a paper entitled "The Weak Points of the Catholic Press," by L. W. Reilly, whose ripe experience as editor successively of two leading Catholic weeklies gave to his outspoken views decided weight. The article, although addressed to the clergy, on whose active co-operation the improvement of the Catholic press is felt largely to depend, found its way into various editors' sanctums. Among other charges made by Mr. Reilly was that of "a lack of standing," by which was meant that our Catholic papers were not, as a rule, the properly accredited official organs of the Bishops. This seemed to be considered by some not a weak, but rather a strong point, and *The Washington Church News* solemnly proclaimed itself "thankful" that Catholic journals are not official publications, and reminded its readers that "official organs are not popular from the very fact that the people like a diversity of sentiment upon non-essentials." It is hard to see how the desire for diversity of sentiment upon non-essentials is balked by the fact that a paper is an official journal. Indeed, the sober earnest with which such a plea is made simply shows that the subject of proper hierarchical control of the Catholic press is misunderstood by some of the men who, of all others, are expected to know the limits as well as the rights and privileges of their profession. The idea that episcopal jurisdiction in regard to the Catholic press is, as a recusant editor recently expressed it, nothing less or more than the claim "to dictate what shall and what shall not go into a Catholic paper," dominates amongst us to a greater extent than one would expect in this age of free inquiry and assertion of individual rights. Such an assumption is of itself a sad commentary on what we have to expect of Catholic journalism under present auspices. However, there is much to be said in behalf of editors, when one undertakes to vindicate the very expedient right of episcopal authority in matters of Catholic journalism. An editor of an official organ, which, with us, means nothing more than a paper which is pub-

lished under proper ecclesiastical supervision, is the freest man in the world, and protected moreover, not only against attacks of those who respect nothing but enforced authority, but also against his own errors, which is a much greater boon. In short, a Catholic journal rightly managed under ecclesiastical supervision enjoys all liberty this side of license, provided the editor possess

(1) Knowledge enough to decide what is sound Catholic doctrine ;

(2) Character enough not to be a time-server and mere flatterer of persons in authority ;

(3) Religion enough not to spread scandals nor to practice detraction (under which name may be included theft of literary property) ;

(4) Tact enough not to give deliberate offence to his superiors, ecclesiastical or civil.

With these qualities the editor may disport himself as he pleases, furnish endless "variety of sentiment in non-essential" topics, chastise error, expose malice, ridicule folly, and, if he can, write original articles which deserve the name. Surely this is a broad field when we remember that it embraces every subject under the sun which admits of treatment from a Catholic point of view ; for we take it that the principal purpose of a *Catholic* newspaper is to explain the Catholic view, especially in those essentials of public life concerning which Catholics need be informed to render their conduct consistent with their faith. In this way are the sterling Catholic journals in different countries managed, which command the respect of friend and foe, and really exercise a far more dominant influence than any individual Bishop.

It may be objected that, whilst the liberty of the editor of a Catholic paper is very large in the abstract, it is practically bound up by the will and power of a diocesan, who may set aside all considerations of justice in the endeavor to enforce his prejudices and caprices. Very true—a Bishop may meddle with the business of an editor, may denounce his paper and excommunicate the writers and readers, and all this wrongfully or unreasonably. Such cases are rare, and when they

occur the abuse of authority can be made to turn effectually against the man who mistakes his position of responsibility for one of serf-master. The editor, if he be actually treated with injustice, has invariably the advantage; for his case allows the double appeal to the public and to higher ecclesiastical authority. But in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the editor to whom a Bishop applies the practice of

*sic volo sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas,*

has imprudently provoked the onslaught; otherwise he will prove his true mettle as a man of judgment and discretion such as an editor should have, by avoiding getting into the wrong through an offensive or ill-judged defence.

There is no injunction in ecclesiastical law against opposing the *views* of a Bishop, unless these views are identical with Catholic doctrine and morals of which the Bishop is the guardian, and, in doubtful cases, the interpreter. The public person of the Bishop whilst he holds rightful position is as sacred as the deposit of faith which he guards and as the laws which he makes for the government of his flock. The fact that a Bishop may err in judgment or in act exempts none of his subjects from the obedience and reverence due to his sacred person and laws, so long as he is the legitimate representative of authority; just as the error of a judge, even when proven by the reversal of his sentence in a superior court does not sanction deliberate contempt of the inferior court.

Which then are the limits that circumscribe, and at the same time guarantee, the freedom of the Catholic press in its relation to episcopal authority? To answer the question properly, we must first define what a "Catholic" journal means; next, in what consists the legitimate authority of the hierarchy, preventive, restrictive and penal.

## I.

A newspaper which assumes for its title "Catholic" pledges itself by that very name to positive service in the domain of the Catholic Church. Its reading matter, its



advertisements and illustrations are not only to convey nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine or modesty, but they are to minister to the wants of Catholics in a way which tends to realize for them the benefits of their religion. It is in this sense that the word "Catholic" is commonly applied even by Protestants, and it is with this tacit understanding that our Catholic people subscribe for a "Catholic" paper. If they want "news" or to be kept informed about professional matters, or to remain alive to the doings of their political party, or to see the latest styles in furnishings, and the like, they find it in the daily papers which most persons nowadays read, or if they don't, it is a sign that they do not care for such information. If then these topics enter into a distinctly "Catholic" paper because they are supposed to be of some value to its readers, they must at least be divested of that form and spirit which render them a danger to faith and morals. The secular journals of to-day are for the most part sensational and not over prudish in matters of decency. Persons who buy such papers know what they have to expect. The parent, however, who reads them is not always willing to let his children do the same. He relies upon the religious weekly to supply in some measure the kind of reading which will inform the young mind over and above the essentials to be learned in the school and church; he expects, moreover, that the misrepresentations and disedifying details, with which the secular press abounds, be righted and counteracted by the religious journal, to which he subscribes for his own information as well as that of the members of his family.

It is a sorry fact that to such expectations, which, expressed or implied, are those of every sensible Catholic who takes a Catholic paper, the answer comes at times a wretched disappointment and often a danger to religion, all the more insidious because invested with a false title. We speak of papers that habitually dish up scandals current in ecclesiastical circles,—criticise measures of church legislation of which the critics have no understanding,—reprint vulgarities which no lady or gentleman cares to see or hear,—publish

quack advertisements with captious headings which lead the reader to believe the subject treats of religious themes,—reproduce the undisguised Gospel cant which appears simultaneously in third-rate Protestant journals but which is made to pass among uninformed Catholics as original contribution,—indulge in systematic and fulsome adulation of priests, choir prima donnas, politicians, local advertisers; nay, corrupt the simplicity of little children by stirring their egotism with the evident view of rousing the vanity of their parents for the purpose of securing subscriptions,—offer combination lists of books and papers to subscribers which in some instances are not merely unfit to be read by any Catholic but are immoral and hostile to the Catholic faith. About plagiarism or patent insides we have but one thing to say. If our journalists find good things free of access let them use these. A first class magazine or paper will hardly begrudge them the borrowed plumes even when no credit is given to the source whence they are taken. But the case is different when, before selling his pilfered ware, the clipper of a journal mutilates it, and destroys a good argument in the attempt to render it original; or if he misuses the names of persons in authority who are made to stand sponsors for his bastard offspring. Such writers or editors have no sense of the responsibility which they assume in behalf of the Catholic name under which they trade.

Is a Bishop or a pastor who is alive to the interests of his flock to be blamed if he refuse to tolerate this sort of systematic imposition? A paper is not a Catholic paper because it assumes the name of "Catholic"; nor because its editor is a Catholic or even a priest; nor because it manages to obtain a card of recommendation from a Church dignitary at home or abroad; nor because the gossip with which it fills its columns turns about Catholics and Bishops and priests. The essential test of a *Catholic* paper is its orthodoxy in matters of faith, its elevated and elevating manner of treating all questions that have a moral aspect, its loyalty to legitimate authority both in Church and State. These are the things which make it *Catholic*, whatever other per-

fections it may possess over and above to recommend its popularity, and secure it a hearing as an efficient and facile educator at the fireside and elsewhere. Without these qualities it has no right to exist under its assumed title, for it is well understood that that title is often the only guise under which an ill-managed paper can effectually enter the Catholic home.

If ecclesiastical superiors have a right to warn their people against imposters who collect money for seemingly religious purposes which only cover mendicancy, then they have, with greater reason, the right to withhold from them the trashy and unwholesome literature which some of our "Catholic" journals at present carry into the homes of Catholic families. They are the parasites that keep the better class of Catholic papers down by engaging the patronage of persons who know not how to discriminate, and are allowed to feed upon intellectual garbage poisoning their faith and loyalty.

## II.

The claim has been recently expressed in defence of editorial liberty that a Catholic writer is under the jurisdiction of his Bishop only in doctrinal matters defined by the Church. The proposition is absurd as well as dangerous to Catholic morals. In the first place, it is explicitly censured in the Syllabus.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, such a limitation would allow a Catholic writer to teach any number of doctrines *contrary* to, and subversive of, the Catholic faith. There is some difference between doctrines *defined* and doctrines *to be believed* in the Catholic Church. Belief in the divinity of Christ was not a defined doctrine before the Council of Nice, when Arius was cast out of the Catholic fold for denying this truth; yet none will maintain that a Catholic was free to controvert or deny

1 Among the condemned propositions contained in the pontifical code, the xxii, occasioned by the pronouncement of a number of theologians and *savants* at the Congress of Munich in 1863, reads: *Obligatio, qua catholici magistri et scriptores omnino adstringuntur, coarctatur in iis tantum quae ab omnibus credenda proponuntur.* (Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas Libenter*, 21 Dec., 1863.)

the belief in the divine Sonship of Christ during the three hundred years which preceded that definition as an article of faith. Dogmas are test-propositions of heresy, not complete embodiments of faith. Theologians therefore wisely distinguish between

(1) Truths of *Catholic faith, i. e.*, dogmas which none can deny without incurring the guilt of heresy ;

(2) Truths of *divine faith, i. e.*, such as are not defined, but yet explicitly contained in the Sacred Scriptures, and sanctioned by authentic tradition ;

(3) Truths embodying *theological conclusions, i. e.*, definite propositions deduced by logical evidence, and in necessary sequence, from antecedent principles given by divine revelation.

Now the obligation of Catholic writers extends to these three categories of truth.

But more. The editor of a Catholic paper has obligations not only in matters of truth to which he is to conform his teaching, he has also obligations of loyalty to which he is bound by the laws of Catholic discipline. Leo XIII, who has been hailed as a pontiff of most liberal views, and one who appreciates the independence and power of the Catholic press, writes on this subject: "It will greatly add to our salutary strength if each country has its own journal doing battle for the truth, but in such a way that each perfectly conforms to the judgment of the Bishop, seconding, by every right means, whatever his prudence dictates. And let the clergy foster these journals with all zeal, and aid them with their learning; and wherever they find men *truly* Catholic who are active in this work, let them give to these most generous support and favor."<sup>1</sup> The Sovereign Pontiff is careful to emphasize the word *truly* (reapse) Catholic when he

<sup>1</sup> Qua prompter apte et salutariter fuerit, si suae propriaeque ephemerides, veluti pro aris focusque propugnantes, unicuique sint regioni, eo modo instituti, *ut nulla in re a iudicio* episcopi abscedant, sed recte studioseque cum eis convenient prudentia et voluntate ; eisdem autem et clerus benigne faveat suaeque afferat doctrinae praesidia, et viri quotquot *reapse* sunt catholici omnem gratiam bonamque pro viribus et facultate opem largiantur. (Epist. Leonis XIII ad Episc. Imperii Austriaci. Mart. 3, 1891 )

speaks of editors who are to be seconded by the clergy.. A Catholic who lacks respect for his ecclesiastical superiors, and who appeals for a justification of that lack to the shortcomings of the person who happens to represent the authority, is not qualified to be an editor, least of all, of a Catholic organ. A Bishop may, like any other person in authority, mistake his rights or his duties, commit errors in faith as in morals from which the humblest of his subjects might remain free ; but such mistakes and errors do not, as we said before, absolve the Catholic from the duty of allegiance and obedience any more than the personal conduct of a captain in the army, or of a State official, frees a subordinate from the obligation of carrying out official orders or defending his national ensign. If a civil or military ruler neglects his duties and demoralizes the ranks, there are means and ways of bringing the injury resulting from such contingency to the notice of higher authority, but until judgment has been rendered, obedience is an absolute requisite of good order, and in such cases loyalty is the wisest of policies. In the Church the same rule applies, and it is a rule most practicable under a hierarchical system which has been for centuries the admiration, and, in many cases, the model of civil organization.

Let editors, then, take the keynote of their paean and the direction of their march from the Bishop of their diocese. This applies to matters of Catholic teaching, Church discipline and general policy on questions which directly touch religion. An editor who opposes his Ordinary is apt to suffer from it, and in nearly every case justly so, because a Bishop has good reason to be cautious in censuring a newspaper, whilst, on the other hand, he must realize that it helps his own cause to have the aid of a good Catholic medium for the work over which he is placed as head and responsible ruler. Open disagreement calls forth the applause only of those who are hostile to the interests and progress of the Catholic cause.

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the right of literary censure, which is at the same time a duty with the guardians of pure Catholic doctrine. The practical force of the Index

laws has been much modified of late years, and that this modification is an outgrowth of newly developed circumstances attendant upon modern civilization is shown by the changes proposed in regard to the subject by the Bishops themselves at the late Vatican Council. As a matter of fact neither its preventive nor its corrective provisions have had any perceptible influence upon our press. This unquestionably accounts to some degree for the weakness of Catholic journalism in the United States when compared with that of England, France and Germany. Ecclesiastical supervision of the press, that is, of the religious press, is as essential to the vigorous growth of a Catholic literary and public spirit as it is to Catholic education, for the simple reason that the religious press is a branch, and a very important one, of our religious teaching system. It supplies what is called in scientific language the apologetic element of the Catholic defence. That element can in no sense be said to be independent of the ecclesiastical authority, much less can it be said to be a slave to ecclesiastical self-will, any more than any other subject or institution in a diocese, provided the managers know their business and attend to it. *The real harm comes from a want of supervision.* It enables, in the first place, any man who can set up a printing press, to assume, without further credentials, the position of instructor in matters essentially within the province of the Church. We have Catholic Weeklies just as we have Catholic shoe stores and Catholic barber shops, which means that the owner or printer is a nominal Catholic. Even less than this is considered requisite. There are Jews, infidels and Protestants who own Catholic newspapers. They hire Catholic "help," that is to say men who, when some accident deprives them of their fictitious position as Catholic editors, too often seek and generally find an opening in Protestant papers, like *The Independent*, by writing anti-Catholic and scandalous articles signed "By a Catholic," and claiming to be revelations of what is going in the "Roman Church."

Yet such papers are supposed to speak the mind of the Catholic Church, to be informed by her teaching and spirit,

even when they bear no mark of approbation from their Bishop. All this could not happen if the editor were made aware that the message he carries to the people, with the badge of the Catholic Church as his credential, must be true; that he cannot utter of his own discretion things for which bishops and priests are made directly responsible; that if he chooses to build a fire at the risk of burning the house of God, he will be made to pay the cost. In short, a Catholic editor is, in justice to the Church and those who truly represent it, obliged to have proper credentials; they may not be demanded by the Bishop who trusts him but he must have them if demanded. Experience has demonstrated that a Bishop cannot easily depose an editor who hinders or injures the Catholic cause, if he is once in possession. In such circumstances a proper and effective policy is suggested by Leo XIII in his Encyclical on the duties of Christian citizenship, in which he recommends Bishops to endorse only able and honorable men who will sustain the true mission of the Church through the press and bids the clergy to encourage and support them in their labors. Open favor shown to the better class of our Catholic newspapers would weaken the hangers-on who trade on both sides of the fence. This supposes, of course, unanimity in the hierarchy, which could be easily effected in this as in other matters relating to the common government of the Church.

By open favor, however, we do not mean "approbations." They rarely do any good and have often done a great deal of harm. The most un-Catholic papers have had and still have the highest approbations. Anybody who knows how such endorsements are made and obtained will agree with us in holding that they inspire no trust, because they imply no responsibility on the part of the approving dignitary, but simply state in other form that "we believe that Mr. so and so is a good man who won't do or write anything rash, and we hope he will be able to sell his paper to you Catholics who trust him as we do." A well managed paper will endeavor to stand on its merits. A personal endorsement may be withdrawn at any time for personal reasons,

and it thus actually limits the freedom of the editor. His loyalty to the Ordinary should be an understood fact and is not to be confounded with conformity to the personal opinions and good-will or favor of the Bishop. An editor may, as we said above, differ from his Bishop in every point of view except in matters of faith or ecclesiastical, particularly diocesan, discipline; but in these, whilst he has rarely the knowledge, he has never the authority to differ with reason. Most Bishops will be reluctant to quarrel with or lose the services of a man who knows how to differ from them unless there is question of obstinate error, or contumacious irreverence.

“Quoniamque fortuna reipublicae potissimum ex eorum pendet ingenio qui populo praesunt, idcirco Ecclesia patrocinium iis hominibus gratiamve praebere non potest, a quibus oppugnari sese intelligat, qui jura ipsius vereri aperte recusent. . . . His praeceptis norma continetur, quam in publica actione vitae catholicum quemque necesse est sequi. Nimirum, ubicumque in negotiis publicis versari per Ecclesiam licet, favendum viris est spectatae probitatis, eisdemque de christiano nomine meritis: neque caussa esse ulla potest cur male erga religionem animatos liceat anteponere.” (*Leo XIII De praecipuis civium Christianorum officiis.*)

We may be allowed in conclusion to say that these remarks are not intended in the spirit of criticism, but rather to draw attention to a fact, the realization of which can only tend to benefit both Catholic editors, and above all, the cause which we live, and profess in common, to defend—the Church of Christ—which alone offers the hope of true progress.

It may seem to those who are not familiar with the variety of papers which pass as “Catholic” in the United States, that we have somewhat exaggerated in what has been said in this article. Yet such is not the case. Of the large number of Catholic exchanges received by us there are several that we would not allow to be read by respectable non-Catholics or young persons, from a legitimate fear of injuring the Catholic name or weakening the Catholic faith.



## CONFERENCES

## THE CORRECT VERSION OF THE OFFICE AND MASS

## "DE SACRA FAMILIA."

The editor of the Roman *Ephemerides Liturgicae* directs attention to some errors in the folio of the new Office of the H. Family, which he ascribes to the carelessness of the printer (typographica incuria). The first two inaccuracies mentioned were practically unimportant omissions which have been supplied since then. A third error is noted as occurring in the Introit of the Mass, which reads "*Exultet gaudio pater justi, gaudeat Pater et Mater tua, et exultet qui genuit te.*" We hesitate to accept the criticism which substitutes *Exultat* in the first part (retaining it in the second) until the authoritative declaration of the Sacred Congregation sanctions the change. The reason assigned by the writer in the *Ephemerides* for the proposed correction is a reference to the text in the Book of Proverbs (xxiii, 23) whence the words of the Introit are evidently taken. This reason seems to us insufficient, for, whilst the verse of the Introit is invariably the verbal text of a psalm, or portion of it, the antiphon, which precedes it, is frequently an *adaptation* from some scriptural text, or even an original wording of a liturgical thought. The *Exultet* is here part of the antiphon and it is not unlikely that it has been intended just as it stands, all the more when we notice that a part of the verse which completes the sentiment as expressed in the Proverbs is here omitted. A similar instance of adaptation may be found in the Tract of this same Mass.

We notice that the Tournai edition prints Ps. lxxxv in the Introit. It should read Ps. lxxxiii.

The Offices are reprinted in this number for reference and the convenience of our readers.

## INCENSE AT HIGH MASS WITHOUT MINISTERS.

*Qu.* REV. AND DEAR SIR.—In Wapelhorst, n. 97 ad 3, I find : “S. R. Congregatio declaravit, in Missa quae cum cantu, sed sine Ministris celebratur, incensationes omnes omittendas esse.”—18 Mart. 1874, de Zachatecas, n. 5581, et 7 Jul. 1880, Salfordien.

In the *Cérémonial Romain* of Falise, an edition bearing the approbation of the S. R. C., “nihil obstat,” dated June 20, 1876, I read : “As a rule at this kind of Mass (cum cantu sed sine Ministris) there is no incense ; the Sacred Congregation of Rites, however, allows the Bishop to tolerate the contrary usage in churches from which its elimination would be difficult.”

Will you kindly inform whether the custom, obtaining for a period of twenty-five or thirty years, of using incense at such Masses is a sufficient authorization for the continuance of the practice ; or whether, in view of the most recent declarations of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, the custom has not lost the force of law ?

*Resp.* There is hardly any doubt that the Sacred Congregation, whilst desirous to prevent the introduction of a custom like the above, would allow it to continue without censure after its having been in existence for a generation or longer. To abrogate it would be apt to scandalize those who have never or rarely seen any other practice, whilst its continuance, having nothing disedifying in it, cannot be construed as a conscious breach of the prescribed ritual, especially where its introduction may not be traced to any particular person or place. The reader may judge for himself from the following two decisions

## II. DUBIUM.

Omnes fere sacerdotes hujus missionis, deficientibus diacono, subdiacono et choro, missam soli cantant, et in eodem altari thurificare solent. Sunt tamen quidam ministri superpelliceis induti a quibus navicula ministratur. (C. P. pro Sin. 16 Jan. 1797. *Vic. Ap. Tunk. Occid.*)

## II. DUBIUM.

Cum in istis regionibus, attento parvo missionariorum numero, difficile sit etiam in solemnioribus festis missam canere cum min-

istris, *in aliquibus missionibus praevaluit usus* thurificandi in missa cantata absque ministris : quaeritur utrum consideratis circumstantiis usus possit tolerari. (C. P. 23 Aug. 1852. *Vic. Ap. Jaffnen.*)

In both cases the same answer was returned by the Sacred Congregation de Propag. Fide, namely : *Non esse inquietandos*. No question was asked nor modification added, although it is plain that the custom in these cases cannot have been much older than that which exists in certain parts of Canada.

---

#### THE "LITANIAE SANCTORUM" IN THE OFFICE.

*Qu.* REVEREND EDITOR :

There is a difference of opinion between A. and B. about the language to be used in the recitation of the Litany of the Saints, when prescribed, as on the feast of St. Mark and Rogation days. A. considers said Litany as an integral part of the divine Office and maintains that, unless a priest recite it in Latin, he does not fulfill his obligation. B., on the contrary, holds that the Litany of the Saints is but an occasional addition to the divine Office, the same as the prayer to be said after Mass, which is no part of the Mass, and that therefore, the use of Latin is not absolutely required, and consequently a priest is not bound to repeat said Litany in Latin after he has recited it already once with the people assisting at Mass on those days. Whose opinion do you think the right one ?

*Resp.* Although the Litany is but "an occasional addition" to the ordinary canonical Hours it constitutes an integral portion of the *liturgical* Office on certain days. As such it cannot be recited in any idiom but that prescribed for the liturgical service, which is the Latin. Adone, in his *Synopsis Canonico-Liturgica*, cites a special decree of the S. C. of Rites (June 8, 1658) saying : *Litanias vulgari* idiomate recitari S. R. C. *non* permittit. Although the same *Dubium* as given in the *Collectio authentica* is answered

by : S. C. respond. *Nihil*, we may readily infer from various other decisions declaring *Lytanias, prout jacent in Breviariis, esse dicendas* (Apr. 1636), that the Latin idiom has to be used in order to fulfill the *canonical* obligation, which is distinct from the *devotional* exercise of reciting the Litany in the vernacular. The latter insures the gaining of an Indulgence, but beyond this is something distinct from the *canonical* recitation which is obligatory.

---

#### THE LIBERA APART FROM THE MASS.

*Qu.* Is the ceremony of the "Libera" to be considered as inseparable from the Requiem Mass ; or may it be recited or sung at a funeral in the afternoon ?

*Resp.* At the end of the ceremonial prescribed for the *Libera* service in the Ritual the rubric adds : " *missa vero si hora fuerit congruens . . non omittatur, nisi obstet magna diei solemnitas aut aliqua necessitas aliter suadeat.*" This implies that the Mass and Office and the *Libera* are not inseparable.

The universal practice sanctioned in the Church, is to recite or sing the *Libera*, beginning with the " *non intres* " down to the end of the form found in the " *Exequiarum Ordo* " of the Ritual whenever the body is brought to the Church.

---

#### THE WHITE SCAPULAR OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY.

Some Manuals of the Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity state that the Scapulars of the Order may be made of white *linen or wool*—" *accipiant et secum ferant scapularium SS. Trinitatis ex lino aut lana alba* " (cf. Beringer,

Ablaesse p. 624.) This fact has caused the S. Congregation, some time ago, to define the matter. (Decret. auth. n. 423 ad. I.) There being still some doubt as to the proper form of the Scapular, the Redemptorist Fathers, who enjoy the faculty of investing in the *five* Scapulars by a single act, requested the General Superior of the disalced Trinitarians in Rome to explain what form was considered proper and authentic for investing members of the Confraternity. In reply the Superior sent a pattern of which we give an exact copy below.

The larger and principal part of the Scapular, which is to be worn on the breast, has the red and blue cross sewed onto its outer surface. Two bands (red and white) connect it with a smaller piece of white woolen cloth having no cross or figure upon it, which hangs from the back over the shoulders. The accompanying letter of the M. General of the Order is as follows :

In the Manual of the Confraternity (of the H. Trinity) it is said that the members must conform to the manner of Scapular worn by the religious, because, in the matter of gaining Indulgences, the means used must not be doubtful but certain. It is therefore requisite that the Scapular be made of white wool, consisting of two parts united by two cords, so as to allow it to fall over the head, one portion, with the cross upon it, hanging down from the shoulders on the breast—the other having no cross, on the back. The colors upon the front Scapular are (according to the Bull of Clement IV “in Ordine vestro,”) *blue* for the transverse or horizontal line, and *red* for the perpendicular line.

The Superior at the same time points out the necessity of conforming to the pattern given by him as the only authentic and proper one, inasmuch as the Order does not consent to accept members of the Confraternity who do not comply with the condition of wearing the Scapular here described.

We append the original letter of the Very Rev. General, and a *facsimile* of the scapular sent with it, prefaced by a few lines in reference to the objects of the Confraternity of the M. Holy Trinity.

PRINCIPAL OBJECT OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE  
HOLY TRINITY.

It has been asked what is the purpose of the Confraternity of the Most Holy Trinity, since the Order of Trinitarians, originally (A. D. 1198) instituted for the liberation and redemption of captives from the yoke of the Turks, no longer exists for that special end, because the aggressive power of the Saracens has long ago been checked by the Christian princes of Europe. The Order of Trinitarians as constituted at present has for its object the following aims. (1) A special devotion to the Most Holy Trinity as the fundamental mystery of Catholic faith. (2) The exercise of works of charity, principally by contributing alms for the relief of Christians in countries hostile to the faith, and also for the purchase of negro children sold in the slave-marts, in order to give them not only their liberty, but also a Christian education. This is the special work to which the Religious of the Order devote themselves, and in which the members of the Confraternity throughout the world directly co-operate by their prayers and alms.

*Monastero dei Trinitari, Scalzi.*

ADMOD. REVERENDE PATER :

. . . In libro manuali confratrum nostrorum, isti dicuntur sese conformari debere religiosis quoad Scapulare ; nam ad indulgentias lucrandas oportet uti mediis certis, non dubiis. Quapropter dictum Scapulare confici debet ex lana alba, constare debet duabus partibus continuatis seu affixis duabus cordulis, ita ut possint caput capere, et per humeros distendi, ut pars cum cruce ad pectus, altera sine cruce ad terga veniat. Crux vero in qualibet sua parte plana esse debet. Quoad dispositionem colorum, sic legitur in bulla Clementis IV incip. *In ordine vestro.* “. . . Crux in pectore cujus brachium quod vadit in transversum sit cærulei coloris.”

Ad majorem rei intelligentiam hic includimus parvum Scapulare pro exemplari aliorum conficiendorum.

Enixe hortamur Reverentiam tuam ut pro tuo posse studeas quatenus forma haec unica Scapularis SSmae Trinitatis omnibus nota sit ; quia nullo pacto intendimus Ordini nostro aggregatas esse

Confraternitates, quae, sive quoad materiam, sive quoad formam, Scapularia a praesenti dissimilia in usu habent, etiamsi ab antiquissimis temporibus eis usi sint. . . .

Addictissimus in Domino

FR. GREGORIUS *a Jesu et Maria,*

MINISTER GENERALIS.

Romae, e N. Conventu S. Chrysogoni Mart. Trans Tiberim, IX Kal. Jan. 1894.



**DISPENSATION FROM ABSTINENCE "IN FORO EXTRA-PENITENTIALI."**

*Qu.* We read in the Apostolic Faculties granted in our diocese "Dispensandi, quando expedire videbitur, super seu carnum, ovorum et lacticiniorum tempore jejuniorum et Quadragesimæ" etc. — I hold that this faculty can be exercised *in foro conscientiae pœnitentia et extra-pœnitentia*, others maintain that the Bishops restrict the exercise of the faculty to the *forum conscientiae pœnitentiale*. Which opinion is correct? A. K.

*Resp.* The application of this Faculty, as it stands, does not appear to be restricted to the confessional. When given, as is customary with us, not only to pastors, but "omnibus confessariis," it delegates complete jurisdiction, not expressly reserved, and empowers confessors to dispense *in foro conscientiae*, that is to say, they must have conscientious reasons for granting the dispensation. This interpretation rests upon the universal custom. "Ex consuetudine," says Ballerini (Opus Morale, vol. I, Tr. iii, C. iv, 287, n. 2, edit 1889), "parochus potest dispensare cum propriis ovibus quoad jejunium, abstinentiam et observationem festorum," and he cites St. Alphonsus as authority for allowing the same privilege to curates. The important restriction in our case is that the dispensation cannot be granted to the parish as a whole, but only to individuals. "Facultatem dispensandi in jejuniis ita concessam esse missionariis ut ea uti nequeant nisi cum *personis particularibus* et justis occurrentibus causis, super

quibus, eorum conscientia onerata, standum eorum iudicio." There is no indication that the words of the S. Congregation, "conscientia onerata," are equivalent to "in foro conscientiae pœnitentiali."

---

### CONFESSORS AND HOLY COMMUNION OF RELIGIOUS.

*Qu.* Has the confessor of a religious community the right to permit members, *in foro conscientiae extra-pœnitentiali*, to receive Holy Communion when not prescribed by their rule? A. K.

*Resp.* The right of admitting persons to Holy Communion, *in foro conscientiae extra-pœnitentiali*, that is, apart from the actual administration of the Sacrament of Penance, is acknowledged by the disciplinary canons of the Church. Thus in a decree of 1679, sanctioned by Innocent XI, the Sacred Congregation, speaking of frequent or daily Communion, says: *Quid singulis permittendum, per se, aut parochos seu confessarios sibi decernendum.* The distinction implied by *parochos seu confessarios* can have but one meaning, namely, that the reception of Holy Communion has no integral connection with the sacramental tribunal of penance. (Decr. S.C.C., 12. Feb., 1679.)

That this law applies in principle to religious is evident from another portion of the same document: "*Itidem moniales quotidie S. Communionem petentes admonendae sunt ut in diebus ex earum Ordinis instituto praestitutis communicent; si quae vero puritate mentis eniteant . . . ut dignae frequentiori aut quotidiana SS. Sacramenti perceptione videri possint id illis a superioribus permittatur.*" In the same way we find this right exercised by the Father General of the Carmelite nuns in Spain, according to the constitution given them by Pius VI. (Vd. Bullar. r. Contin. t. vii, p. 613, edit. Rom.)

It follows, then, that where the Sacred Congregation con-



finer the exercise of this right to confessors, not allowing it to spiritual directors or superiors, the very distinction implies that it may be exercised *in foro extra-poenitentiali*, only by the proper confessor, who may, however, accidentally, be the spiritual director or superior.

This we take to be the meaning of the answer given by the Sacred Congregation to the query: "An et cujus de licentia Eucharistiam recipere debent moniales, quae eam recipere volunt ultra dies statutos a constitutionibus vel a consuetudine monasterii ut in illis omnes moniales communicent?"

*Resp.* De licentia confessarii ordinarii et non directorum (multo minus superiorissae) praevia participatione praelati ordinarii." (S. C. C., 14 Apr., 1725.)

The restriction, viewed in the light of the general and legitimate practice, can hardly have any other reason than to prevent errors and confusion in the direction of souls, since the ordinary confessor can best judge of the spiritual necessities of the individual placed under his care, whose direction, however, he need not confine to the sacred tribunal when the penitent desires or needs it at other times.

---

### THE ANGELUS.

*Qu.* There are different ways used in reciting the *Angelus* in churches where the celebrant says it in common with the congregation on Sundays after the late Mass. The subject is discussed in a recent number of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* but does not cover the whole ground. Please answer the following points:

1. Does it suffice to say the three versicles "The Angel of the Lord declared" etc., with three Hail Mary's, or must the prayer "Pour forth we beseech thee" etc., be also said in order to gain the Indulgence attached to the *Angelus*?

2. Can an "Our Father" or any other suitable prayer be substituted for the one "Pour forth we beseech thee" etc., without forfeiting the indulgence?

3. Should the *Angelus* be said *standing* on Sundays, since the Brief of Benedict XIII, granting the Indulgence, and to which the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* refers, says that it should be recited *kneeling*?

4. Is the "Glory be to the Father" etc., usually said three times after the *Angelus*, a part of the prayer and necessary for gaining the Indulgence?

5. Is it necessary in order to gain the Indulgence that the *Regina Cæli* be recited during Paschal time instead of the *Angelus*?

*Resp.* What Canon O'Loan says about the *Angelus* in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* is quite correct, except as to the kneeling. This was indeed the original requirement, but Benedict XIV, some twenty years later modified the conditions laid down by Benedict XIII, and ordained (Apr. 20, 1742) that the *Angelus* is to be said *standing* on Saturday evenings and Sundays.

Accordingly the answers to the above queries, as indicated in the *Raccolta*, are briefly :

1. The three versicles and Hail Mary's suffice for those who recite them *at the sound of the bell*. (Members of Religious Communities, legitimately prevented from saying the *Angelus* at the sound of the bell, gain the Indulgence by performing the devotion immediately afterwards.)

2. The prayer "Pour forth, we beseech thee" etc., with the preceding versicle "Pray for us O Holy Mother of God" etc., are required only when the *Angelus* is recited in places where the bell is not rung or also when a person is prevented from kneeling, as prescribed, at the sound of the *Angelus*. Those who do not know these prayers can gain the same Indulgence by saying *five Hail Marys*.

3. The *Angelus* should be said *standing* on Saturday evenings and Sundays.

4. The "Glory be to the Father" etc., is no essential part of the *Angelus* prayer.

5. The *Regina Cæli* should be said, but for those who do not know the prayer the Indulgence mentioned above is gained by reciting the *Angelus* under the usual conditions.

THE APOSTOLIC BLESSING IN "ARTICULO MORTIS."

*Qu.* Are the prayers to be found in the Ritual for imparting the Apostolic Blessing *in articulo mortis* to be recited of necessity in the case where the priest has a crucifix blessed by the Sovereign Pontiff for this purpose, or will it suffice to sign the sick person with such a crucifix, and, having briefly explained the purpose of the action, cause the recipient of the Indulgence to pronounce the usual pious ejaculation?

If the Crucifix confers the blessing without the formal prayers, may any priest use it, other than the one for whose use it was originally blessed?

*Resp.* It depends on the manner in which the Indulgence was communicated by the Sovereign Pontiff. The Jesuits, the Brothers of Mercy (S. Camillus Lellis) and others use crucifixes to which the Apostolic Blessing *in articulo mortis* is attached for the application of which no special formula is required. But this is expressly stated in the pontifical concession. Beringer in his annotated edition of Maurel's exhaustive and authentic work on Indulgences, says that crucifixes blessed by the Holy Father, for the use of priests administering to the dying, impart the Indulgence *in articulo mortis* only when used in conjunction with the form prescribed in the Ritual—unless a *special written faculty* be obtained similar to that given to the above-mentioned Religious.<sup>1</sup> This faculty declares: "Religiosis Societatis deferentibus osculandam vel tangendam imaginem Crucifixi (quam semel electam mutare non licet, nisi in eventu amissionis) cuicumque infirmo confesso et Sacra Communionem refecto, vel saltem invocanti nomen Jesu ut plenariam indulgentiam applicare possint, etc." In other cases the privilege attached to a crucifix blessed for the above-mentioned purpose is identical with that usually granted in the Apostolic faculties for missionary countries.

1. Melata *Manuale Indulgentiarum* (p. 144) thinks that when the Pope gives the privilege orally without making any restriction, it might be considered as waiving all conditions. This seems rather doubtful in view of the customary limitations.

A crucifix indulgenced by the Pope in the usual manner, or *ab homine*, as it is called, cannot be transferred or used by any one except the person for whom it was originally blessed, or to whom it was given first for personal use—"jubet deinde Summus Pontifex indulgentias . . . non transire ab illis pro quibus benedicta fuerint, vel illis quibus ab iis prima vice fuerint distributa . . . nec posse pariter commodari vel precario aliis tradi ad hoc ut indulgentiam communicent." (Decr. ab Alexandro VII edit. 6 Feb. 1657.) This decree retains its force according to an express declaration of the present Pontiff.

---

#### THE "FORTY HOURS" EXPOSITION.

*Qu.* In this diocese we have the privilege of placing the Bl. Sacrament in the Tabernacle at night during the Forty Hours' Devotion. In using this privilege are we obliged to continue the devotion until forty hours of actual exposition have elapsed, in order to gain the indulgences?

*Resp.* Although the *Clementine Instruction* which lays down the norm to be followed in the Forty Hours' Adoration need not be adhered to in all details where the circumstances under the sanction of the Ordinary call for a change, it seems that, in point of duration, the time of forty hours is substantially required to satisfy the terms of the Indult by which the indulgences of the *altare privilegiatum* and others in favor of the adorers, are to be gained. The interruption of the prayer during the night is one of the changes allowed by the S. Congregation; but with the understanding that compensation be made for the same by protracting the adoration for three days. That the duration of *substantially* forty hours is not a wholly optional feature of the devotion, would also appear from the decrees of the Provincial Acts of the Milanese Church where the devotion had its origin. "Orationis hujus curatores videant, ut *per quadraginta ipsas*

*horas* continenter fiat; ac ne ad momentum quidem temporis . . . intermittatur.—Quod si noctu orantes deerunt SS. Sacramentum in tabernaculo reponatur. Quod si fore ex hac vel alia causa Episcopi jussu aliquando noctu intermitti contigerit, *inter diu compensetur continenti orandi spatio.*” Act. Eccl. Mediol, P. I Conc. Prov. iv, p. 118.

Elsewhere in the same Decrees the Council ordains not to protract the Devotion beyond the forty hours of required duration. “Praefinito illo quadraginta horarum tempore, nec vero diutius, in Ecclesia ubi concessum est, oratio haec celebretur.”

To fill the requisite number of hours, the Adoration lasts three days, beginning usually about 6 in the morning and ending about 8 in the evening, which allows for some additional hours during which the sermons take place, the Bl. Sacrament being veiled during that time. In some places, outside of the United States, the adoration lasts four days, of ten hours each.

When it is impossible to observe the forty Hours' prayer in this modified form, the Church provides other methods of adoration during which the faithful may gain similar indulgences, so that there is no necessity for seeking compromise by mutilating the prescribed ritual of the so-called “Forty Hours' ” Adoration. (Cf. Conc. Plen. Balt. II, n. 376-378.)

## ANALECTA.

## DE CANONICIS AD HONOREM NOMINATIS.

*(Decretum.)*

LEO PP. XIII.

*Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.*

Illud est proprium humanarum institutionum et legum, ut nihil in eis sit tam bonum atque utile, quod vel consuetudo non mutet, vel tempora non invertant, vel mores non corrumpant. Sic in militanti Ecclesia Dei, in qua cum absoluta ac perpetua immutabilitate doctrinae varietas discipline coniungitur, non raro evenit ut, quae olim iure meritoque in honore et pretio habebantur, aliquando obsolecant, et quae bona in instituto erant, ea labens aetas faciat deteriora. Sub prima Ecclesiae exordia, cum sensus Christi in hominum mente arctius insidebat, Episcopos, quibus summa rerum gerendarum commissa erat, delectos Sacerdotes sibi socios addidisse memoriae traditum est, quorum consilio et ministerio in gravioribus Ecclesiae negotiis uterentur. Hi Sacerdotes, Assessores et quasi Episcopi Senatus, Canonici dicti sunt, ex eo quia in observandis regulis Ecclesiasticis cautiore et diligentiores erant ceteris, et eam vitam vivebant, ut mensuram nominis implerent. Quamobrem pro certo habendum est ad conservandam Ecclesiasticam disciplinam, Canonicorum dignitates ab initio fuisse constitutas ita, ut qui eas obtineret, id haberet oneris, ut opera et officiis adiuveret Episcopum, et in iis quae pertinent, ad cultum et ad mores, sese tamquam exemplar clericis inferioribus impertiret. At temporibus nostris nonnulli sunt, qui pristinae institutionis immemores, Canonicorum collegia tamquam honoratorum ordines esse autumant, in quibus nullum onus, sed dignitatis tantum et honoris tituli inhaereant. Ex quo fit ut, cum humanum sit onus defugere, honores et dignitates appetere, non parvus sit numerus eorum, qui studeant saltem honoris causa, inter Canonicos cooptari. Multae quidem ac plenae querelarum datae sunt ad nos litterae ab Episcopis, qui aegre ferunt honoribus et dignitatibus inhiare eos, qui sacerdotio aucti, deberent "aemulari charismata meliora, terrena despiciere, et nonnisi in Cruce Domini Nostri Iesu Christi gloriari." Sacerdotes autem huius modi

plerique iuniores, qui parum vel nihil in Ecclesiae bonum contulerunt, tamquam tirones gloriosi veteranorum insignia atque ornamenta virtutis praemia appetentes, externos circumeunt Antistites, ut ab iis honoris insignia titulosque, a suis negatos, extorqueant. Nos, qui dignitatis insignibus eos potissimum honestandos censuimus Sacrorum administros, qui pietatis et doctrinae laudibus ceteros antecellunt, deque re christiana egregie sunt meriti, hanc super rem admonitiones Apostolicas atque instructiones, nominatim die decimo sexto mensis Septembris anno MDCCCLXXXIV per Sacram Congregationem Tridentini Concilii interpretem ac vindicem dedimus. Quum vero hisce diebus complures Sacrorum Antistites gravius conquesti sint eiusmodi honores, qui merentibus praemio, ceteris incitamento virtutis esse debent, non raro ipsis Ordinariis insciis, atque interdum haud dignioribus conferri; Nos, quo in posterum quilibet in tali re abusus auferatur, rogata Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis sententia, suprema Auctoritate Nostra statuimus, decrevimus: I. Episcopus, seu Ordinarius, ecclesiasticum quempiam virum alienae dioeceseos Canonicum ad honorem nominaturus, praeter Capituli sui consensum, Ordinarii, cui nominandus subiicitur, notitiam et votum obtineat, eundemque Ordinarium insignia edoceat ac privilegia, quorum usus nominando tribueretur. II. Canonici ad honorem extra dioecesim in qua nominati sunt, degentes, numero sint tertia parte minores cunctis Canonicis a Pontificiis Constitutionibus respectivae Basilicae, sive Ecclesiae Metropolitanae, aut Cathedrali, vel Collegiatae adsignatis. III. Canonici ad honorem alicuius minoris Basilicae, vel Ecclesiae Collegiatae almae Urbis nominati, privilegiis et insignibus uti possunt tantum intra respectivae Basilicae vel Collegiatae, eiusque Filialium Ecclesiarum ambitum, ubi Canonici de numero iisdem fruuntur. Qui vero alicuius Metropolitanae, vel Cathedralis, aut Collegiatae Ecclesiae, seu Basilicae minoris extra Urbem Canonici sunt ad honorem, privilegiis et insignibus tantum utantur in Dioecesi ubi nominati sunt, nullo modo extra illius territorium. IV. Haec omnia servantur quoque a Canonicis ad honorem usque ad hanc diem nominatis. Ita volumus, edicimus, decernentes has litteras Nostras firmas sertasque, uti sunt, ita in posterum permanere: irritum vero et inane futurum decernentes si quid super his a quoquam contigerit attentari: non obstantibus Nostris et Cancellariae Apostolicae regulis de iure quaesito non tollendo, et quibusvis specialibus vel generalibus Apostolicis Constitutionibus ac Privilegiis, gratiis et indultis, etiam confirmatione Apostolica, vel quavis

alia firmitate roboratis, et Litteris Apostolicis sub quibuscumque tenoribus ac formis, et cum quibusvis clausulis et decretis quibusvis Capitulis, Collegiis ac etiam peculiaribus personis quacumque ecclesiastica dignitate pollutibus, quocumque tempore etiam per Nos concessis, nec non quibusvis consuetudinibus, etiam immemorabilibus, latissime et plenissime, ac specialiter et expresse de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine derogando, ac derogatum esse volumus, ceterisque in contrarium quomodolibet facientibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub Annulo Piscatoris die XXIX Ianuarii MDCCCXCIV. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Decimosexto.

M. Card. RAMPOLLA.

---

**OFFICIUM S. FAMILIAE.**

*Dom. III. Post Epiph.*

SANCTAE FAMILIAE JESU, MARIAE, JOSEPH.

*Duplex majus.*

AD VESPERAS.

*Añã.* 1. Jacob autem g nuit Joseph virum Mariae, de qua natus est Jesus, qui voc tur Christus.

*Psalmi ut in Festis B. V. M.*

2. Angelus D mini apparuit in somnis Joseph, dicens : Joseph fili David, noli timere accipere Mariam conjugem tuam : quod enim in ea natum est, de Spiritu sancto est.

3. Pastores venerunt festinantes, et inveniunt Mariam, et Joseph, et Infantem positum in praesepio.

4. Magi intrantes domum inveniunt Puerum cum Maria matre ejus.

5. Erat pater ejus et mater mirantes super his, quae dicebantur de illo.

*Capitulum.* Lucae ij.

Descendit Jesus cum Maria et Joseph, et venit Nazareth, et erat subditus illis.



*Hymnus.*

O Lux beáta Coelitúm,  
 Et summa spes mortálium,  
 Jesu, o cui doméstica  
 Arrisit orto cáritas.  
 Maria, dives grátia,  
 O sola quae casto potes  
 Fovére Jesum pectore,  
 Cum lacte donans óscula.  
 Tuque ex vetústis páribus  
 Delécte custos Virginis,  
 Dulci patris quem nómine  
 Divina proles invocat.  
 De stirpe Jesse nóbili  
 Nati in salútem géntium,  
 Audite nos qui súpplikes  
 Vestras ad aras sistimus.  
 Dum sol redux ad vésperum  
 Rebus nitórem détrahit,  
 Nos hic manéntes intimo  
 Ex corde vota fúndimus.  
 Qua vestra sedes flóruit  
 Virtútis omnis grátia,  
 Hanc detur in domésticis  
 Reférre posse móribus.  
 Jesu, tibi sit glória,  
 Qui natus es de Virgine,  
 Cum Patre, et almo Spiritu,  
 In sempitérna saecula. Am.

*V.* Verbum caro factum est, allelúia.

*R.* Et habitávit in nobis, allelúia.

*Ad Magnificat, Aña.* Beáti qui hábitant in domo tua, Dómine :  
 in saecula saeculórum laudábunt te.

*Oratio ut in Laud.*

*Commem. Dñicae occurr.*

## AD MATUTINUM.

*Invitat.* Christum Dei Filium, Mariae et Joseph súbditum,

\* Venite adorémus.

*Ps.* Venite.

*Hymnus.*

Sacra jam splendent decoráta lychnis  
 Templá, jam sertis redimitur ara,  
 Et pio fumant redoléntque acérrae  
 Thuris honóre.

Num juvet summo Géniti Parénte  
 Régios ortus celebráre cantu ?  
 Num domus David, decóra et vetústae  
 Nómína gentis ?

Grátius nobis memoráre parvum  
 Názaræ tectum, tenuémque cultum ;  
 Grátius Jesu tácitam reférre  
 Cármine vitam.

Nili ab extrémis peregrinus oris,  
 Angeli ductu, própere remigrat  
 Multa perpéssus Puer, et patérno  
 Limine sospes.

Arte qua Joseph húmili excoléndus,  
 Abdito Jesus juvenéscit aevo,  
 Seque fabrilis sócium labóris  
 Adjicit ultro.

Irriget sudor mea membra, dixit,  
 Antequam sparso mádeant cruóre :  
 Haec quoque humano géneri expiándo  
 Poena .

Assidet Nato pia Mater almo,  
 Assidet Sponso bona nupta ; felix  
 Si potest curas releváre fessis  
 Múnere amico.

O, neque expértes óperæ et labóris,  
 Nec mali ignári, miseros juváte,  
 Quos reluctántes per acúta rerum  
 Urget egéstas.

Démite his fastus, quibus ampla splendet  
 Fáustitas, mentem date rebus æquam :  
 Quotquot implórant cólumen, benigno  
 Cérnite vultu.

Sit tibi, Jesu, decus atque virtus,  
 Sancta qui vitæ documénta praebeas,  
 Quique cum summo Genitóre et almo  
 Flámine regnas. Amen.

## IN PRIMO NOCTURNO.

*Añā.* Cum indúcerent púerum Jesum paréntes ejus : accépit eum Simeon in ulnas suas, et benedixit Deum. *Psalmi trium Nocturn. ut in Festis B. M. V. per Ann.*

*Añā.* Ut perfecérunt ómnia secúndum legem Dómini, revérsi sunt in Galilaeam in civitátem suam Náza-reth.

*Añā.* Puer autem crescébat et confortabá-tur plenus sapiéntia, et grátia Dei erat in illo.

*V.* Propter nos egénus factus est, cum esset dives.

*R.* Ut illius inópia nos divites essémus.

*De Epistola beáti Pauli Apóstoli ad Colossénses.*

*Lectio j. Cap. iij b. et iv.*

Indúite vos ergo sicut elécti Dei, sancti et dilécti, viscera misericórdiae, benignitátem, humilitátem, modéstiam, patiéntiam : supportántes invicem, et donántes vobismetipsis, si quis advérsus áliquem habet querélam : sicut et Dóminus donávit vobis, ita et vos. Super ómnia autem haec, caritátem habéte, quod est vinculum perfectiónis : et pax Christi exsúltet in córdibus vestris, in qua et vocáti estis in uno córpore : et grati estóte. Verbum Christi hábitet in vobis abundánter, in omni sapiéntia, docéntes et commonéntes vosmetipsos psalmis, hymnis, et cánticis spirituálibus, in grátia cantántes in córdibus vestris Deo.

*R.* In terris visus est, "Et cum hominibus conversátus est.

*V.* Hic adinvénit omnem viam disciplinae, et trádidit illam Jacob púero suo.—Et cum.

*Lectio i j.*

Omne quodcúmque fácitis in verbo aut in ópere, ómnia in nómine Dómini Jesu Christi, grátias agéntes Deo et Patri per ipsum. Mulieres súbditae estóte viris, sicut opórtet, in Dómino. Viri, diligite uxóres vestras, et nolite amári esse ad illas. Filii, obedite paréntibus per ómnia : hoc enim plácitum est in Dómino. Patres, nolite ad indignatió-nem provocáre filios vestros, ut non pusillo ánimo fiant.

*R.* Beáti qui hábitant. \*In domo tua Dne.

*V.* In saecula saeculórum laudábunt te.—In domo.

*Lectio iii.*

Servi, obedite per ómnia dáminis carnálibus, non ad óculum serviéntes, quasi hominibus placéntes, sed in simplicitáte cordis, tíméntes Deum. Quodcúmque fácitis, ex ánimo operámini, sicut Dómino, et non hominibus, sciéntes quod a Dómino accipiétis

retributiónem hereditátis. Dómino Christo servite. Qui enim injúriam facit, recipiet id quod inique gessit: et non est personárum accéptio apud Deum. Dómini, quod justum est et aequum, servis praestáte: sciéntes quod et vos Dóminum habétis in coelo. Oratióni instáte, vigilántes in ea in gratiárum actióne.

*R.* Débuit per ómnia frátribus assimilári, \*Ut miséricors fieret.

*V.* Cum esset Filius Dei, didicit ex iis, quae passus est obediéntiam.—Ut. Glória Patri. Ut.

IN SECUNDO NOCTURNO.

*Añã.* Consúrgens Joseph accépit púerum et matrem ejus nocte, et secéssit in Ægyptum.

*Añã.* Angelus Dómini appáruit in somnis Joseph in Ægypto, dicens: Surge et áccope púerum et matrem ejus, et vade in terram Israel.

*Añã.* Et véniens habitávit Názareth, ut adimplerétur quod dictum est per Prophétas: quóniam Nazaraeus vocábitur.

*V.* Docébit nos Dóminus vias suas.

*R.* Et ambulábimus in sémitis suis.

*Lectio iv.* Sermo sancti Ambrósii Episcopi.

*Exp. in Ps. xxxv, et lxi.*

Subditus esto Dómino, et óbseca eum. Christus faciendo voluntátem Patris, legem implévit. Et ideo finis est legis et plenitúdo est caritátis; quia diligens Patrem, affectum omnem ejus adhibuit voluntáti. Dénique pro pietáte erat non pro infirmitáte Joseph et Mariae paréntibus súbditus. Suscépit itaque compassiόνem nostram, suscépit et subjectiόνem. Quod enim subjécit sibi ómnia, suum est: quod subjéctus est, nostrum est. Anima, inquit, súbdita non divinitas, ánima subjécta, non Dei virtus. Per ipsam ergo obediéntia per ipsam humilitas: quae tamen non ad infirmitátem poténtiae suscépta sunt, sed ad magistérium disciplinae.

*R.* Ego autem mendicus sum et pauper: \*Déus sollicitus est mei.

*V.* Labóres mánuum tuárum quia manducábis, beátus es, et bene tibi erit.—Déus.

*Lectio v.*

Quasi homo ergo ex his, quae passus est, didicit obediéntiam, ut consummarétur in carne et per obediéntiae transfúsam in nos successiόνem causa fieret nobis salutis aeternae, quibus ante per inobediéntiae hereditátem primus ille Adam causa factus est mortis. Subjéctio ergo magistérium virtútis humámae, non divinae

imminutio potestatis est. Nam si illum minorem Filium et inaequalem Patri dicunt, quia erat subditus Patri Deo ; numquid et matre ideo minor, quia subditus erat matri? Lectum est enim de Joseph et Maria : Et erat subditus illis. Sed pietas omnibus nobis non dispendio, sed incremento est ; per quam omnibus nobis Dominus Jesus fidem infudit et gratiam, ut nos spiritu fidei subditos Patri faciat Deo.

*R.* Vulpes foveas habent, et volucres coeli nidos, \*Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet.

*V.* Pauper sum ego, et in laboribus a juventute mea.—Filius.

*Lectio vj. Ibid. in Ps. lxx.*

Denique, si consideremus, in paradiso defecit humilitas, et ideo venit de coelo. In paradiso orta est inobedientia, et ideo obedientia cum Salvatore descendit. Inflabatur caro, unde subiectio mansuetudinis inveniri non poterat in terris. Veniens Dominus Jesus primum se exinanivit, non rapinam arbitratus esse se aequalem Deo, formam servi sibi accipiens, et specie inventus ut homo, humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem. Dicat ergo : juvenis sum et despectus : quia Christus in paupere atque despecto mundum redemit, quia Christus humilitate diabolum vicit.

*R.* Cum in forma Dei esset, semetipsum exinanivit, \*Formam servi accipiens.

*V.* Humiliavit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem.—Formam. Gloria Patri. Formam.

#### IN TERTIO NOCTURNO.

*Añã.* Ibant parentes Jesu per omnes annos in Jerusalem in die solenni Paschae.

*Añã.* Cum redirent, remansit puer Jesus in Jerusalem, et non cognoverunt parentes ejus.

*Añã.* Non inveniẽtes Jesum, regressi sunt in Jerusalem, requirẽtes eum.

*V.* Pauper sum ego, et in laboribus a juventute mea.

*R.* Exultatus autem humiliatus sum, et conturbatus.

Lectio sancti Evangelii secundum Lucam.

*Lectio vij. Cap. ij.*

Cum factus esset Jesus annorum duodecim, ascendentibus illis Jerosolyman secundum consuetudinem diei festi, consummatisque diebus, cum redirent, remansit puer Jesus in Jerusalem, et non cognoverunt parentes ejus. Et reliqua.

Homilia S. Bernárdi Abbátis.

*Homil. j. supra Missus est.*

Et erat súbditus illis. Quis, quibus? Deus hominibus, Deus, inquam, cui Angeli súbditi, sunt, cui Principátus et Potestátes obédiunt, súbditus erat Mariae, nec tantum Mariae, sed étiam Joseph propter Mariam. Miráre ergo utrúmlibet, et élige quid ámplius miréris, sive Filii benignissimam dignatiónem, sive paréntum excellentissimam dignitátem. Utrimque stupor, utrimque miráculum: et quod Deus hómīni obtémperet, humilitas absque exémplo: et quod Deo homo principétur, sublimitas sine sócio. In láudibus virginum singuláriter cánitur quod sequúntur Agnum quocúmque ierit. Quibus ergo láudibus júdicas dignum, qui etiam praeit?

*R.* Vere tu es Rex absconditus, \*Deus Israel Salvátor.

*V.* Tu doces hómīnem sciéntiam.—Deus.

*Lectio viij.*

Disce, homo, obedire; disce, terra, subdi; disce, pulvis, obtemperáre. De auctóre tuo loquens Evangelista, Et erat, inquit, súbditus illis; haud dúbium quin Mariae et Joseph. Erubésce, supérbe cinis! Deus se humiliat, et tu te exáltas? Deus se hominibus subdit, et tu, dominári géstiens hominibus, tuo te praepónis auctóri? Quóties enim hominibus praeesse desidero, tóties Deum praeire conténdo: et tunc vere non sápio et quae Dei sunt. De ipso namque dictum est: Et erat súbditus illis. Si hómīnis, o homo, imitári designáris exémplum, certe non erit tibi indignum sequi auctórem tuum. Si non potes fórsitan sequi eum quocúmque ierit, dignáre vel sequi quo tibi condescéndit.

*R.* Sicut per inobediéntiam unius hómīnis peccatóres constitúti sunt multi: \*Ita et per unius obeditiόnem justī constituéntur multi.

*V.* Venit Názareth et erat súbditus illis.—Ita. Glória Patri. Ita.

*Lectio ix. de Homil. Dñicae: si vero transferatur,*

*Lectio ix.*

Si non potes sublimem incédere sémitam virginitátis, séquere vel Deum per tutissimam viam humilitátis: a cujus rectitúdine si qui étiam vírgines deviáverint, ut verum fátear, nec ipsi sequúntur Agnum quocúmque ierit. Séquitur quidem Agnum coinquinátus húmilis, séquitur et virgo supérbus, sed neuter quocúmque ierit; quia nec ille ascéndere potest ad munditiam Agni, qui sine macula est; nec is ad ejúsdem mansuetúdinem descéndere dignátur, qua

scilicet non coram tondente, sed coram occidente se obmútuít. Attamen salubriórem elégit sequéndi partem in humilitáte peccátor, quam in virginitáte supérbus : cum et illius immunditiam sua húmilis satisfáctio purget, et hujus pudicitiam supérbia inquinet. *Te Deum.*

AD LAUDES,  
*et per Horas, Añae.*

1. Post triduum \*invenérunt Jesum in templo sedéntem in médio doctórum, audiéntem illos, et interrogántem eos.
2. Dixit mater \*Jesu ad illum : Fili, quid fecisti nobis sic? Ecce pater tuus et ego doléntes quaerebámus te.
3. Descéndit Jesus \*cum eis, et venit Názareth, et erat súbditus illis.
4. Et Jesus proficiébat sapiéntia, et aetate, et grátia apud Deum et hómines.
5. Et dicébant : “ Unde huic sapiéntia haec, et virtútes? Nonne hic est fabri filius?

*Capitulum. Lucae ij.*

Descéndit Jesus cum Maria et Joseph, et venit Názare erat súbditus illis.

*Hymnus.*

O Gente felix hóspita  
Augústa sedes Názarae,  
Quae fovit alma Ecclésiae  
Et prótulit primórdia.  
Sol, qui perérrat áureo  
Terras jacéntas lúmíne,  
Nil grátius per saecula  
Hac vidit aede, aut s nctius.  
Ad hanc frequéntes cónvolant  
Coeléstis aulae núntii,  
Virtútis hoc sacrárium  
Visunt, revisunt, éxcolunt.  
Qua mente Jesus, qua manu,  
Optáta patris pérficit !  
Quo Virgo gestit gáudio  
Matérna obire múnera !  
Adest amóris párticeps  
Curaeque Joseph cónjugi,  
Quos mille jungit néxibus

Virtútis auctor grátia.  
 Hi diligéntis invicem  
 In Jesu amórem cónfluunt  
 Utrique Jesus mutuae  
 Dat caritátis praemia.  
 Sic fiat, ut nos cáritas  
 Jungat perénni foedere,  
 Pacémque alens domésticam  
 Amára vitae tēperet!  
 Jesu, tibi sit glória,  
 Qui natus es de Virgine,  
 Cum Patre, et almo Spiritu,  
 In sempitérna saecula. Amen.

*V.* Ponam univérsos filios tuos doctos a Dómino.

*R.* Et multitudínem pacis filius tuis.

*Ad Benedictus Aña.* Illumináre nos Dómine exémpis familiae tuae, et dirige pedes nostros in viam pacis.

*Oratio..*

Domine Jesu Christe, qui Mariae et Joseph súbditus, domésticam vitam, ineffabilibus virtútibus consecrásti: fac nos, utriúsque auxilio, familiae sanctae tuae exémpis instrui; et consórtium cánsequi sempitérnum. Qui vivis.

*Commem. Dñicae occurr.*

*Ad Primam, in R. br.*

*V.* Qui natus es de Maria Virgine.

AD TERTIAM.

*Capit.* Descéndit. *supra.* 7.

*R. br.* Propter nos egénus factus est. \*Cum esset dives. Propter. *V.* Ut illius inópia nos divites essémus. Cum esset. Glória. Propter. *V.* Docébit nos Dóminus vias suas. *R.* Et ambulábimus in sémitis ejus.

AD SEXTAM.

*Capitulum. Rom. v.*

Sicut per inobediéntiam unius hóminis peccatóres constitúti sunt multi, ita et per unius obeditiònem justí constituéntur multi.

*R. br.* Docébit nos Dóminus, \*Vias suas. Docébit.

*V.* Et ambulábimus in sémitis ejus. Vias suas. Gloria Patri. Docébit nos.

*V.* Pauper sum ego, et in labóribus a juventúte mea.

*R.* Exaltátus autem, humiliátus sum, et conturbátus.



## AD NONAM.

*Capitulum. Philipp. ij.*

Semetipsum exinanivit formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inventus ut homo.

*R. br.* Pauper sum ego, et in laboribus. \*A juventute mea. Pauper. *V.* Exaltatus autem, humiliatus sum, et conturbatus. A juventute. Gloria Patri. Pauper.

*V.* Ponam universos filios tuos doctos a Domino.

*R.* Et multitudinem pacis filiis tuis.

*In ij. VESPERIS.*

*Añae de Laud. ut supra. 7. Psalmi ut in Festis B. M. V. Capitulum et Hymnus ut in j. Vesperis, supra. 1.*

*V.* Ponam universos filios tuos doctos a Domino.

*R.* Et multitudinem pacis filiis tuis.

*Ad Magnificat, Aña.* Maria autem conservabat omnia verba haec conferens in corde suo. *Comm. Dñicae occ.*

## MISSA.

DOMINICA TERTIA POST EPIPHANIAM.

*Sanctae Familiae Jesu, Mariae, Joseph.*

*Introitus. Prov. 23.*

Exsultet gaudio pater Justi, gaudeat Pater tuus et Mater tua, et exsultet quae genuit te. *Ps. 83.* Quam dilecta tabernacula tua. Domine virtutum: concupiscit et deficit anima mea in atria Domini.

*V.* Gloria Patri.

*Oratio.*

Domine Jesu Christe, qui Mariae et Joseph subditus, domesticam vitam ineffabilibus virtutibus consecrasti: fac nos, utriusque auxilio, Familiae sanctae tuae exemplis instrui; et consortium consequi sempiternum: Qui vivis.

*Lectio Epistolae beati Pauli Apostoli ad Colossenses. c. 3.*

Induite vos ergo sicut electi Dei, sancti, et dilecti, viscera misericordiae, benignitatem, humilitatem, modestiam, patientiam: supportantes invicem, et donantes vobismetipsis, si quis adversus aliquem habet querelam: sicut et Dominus donavit vobis, ita et vos. Super omnia autem haec, caritatem habete, quod est vinculum

perfectiónis. Et pax Christi exúltet in córdibus vestris, in qua et vocáti estis in uno córpore: et grati estóte. Verbum Christi habitet in vobis abundánter, in omni sapiéntia, docèntes, et commonéntes vosmetipsos psalmis, hymnis, et cántibus spirituálibus, in grátia cantántes in córdibus vestris Deo. Omne quodcúmque fácitis in verbo, aut in ópere, ómnia in nómine Dómini Jesu Christi grátias agéntes Deo et Patri per ipsum.

*Graduale. Ps. 26.* Unam pétii a Dómino, hanc requiram; ut inhábitem in domo Dómini ómnibus diébus vitæ meæ. *V.* Beáti qui hábitant in domo tua, Dómine, in saecula saeculórum laudábunt te.

Alleúlia, alleúlio. *V. Isaiæ 45.* Vere tu es Rex absconditus, Deus Israel Salvátor. Alleúlia.

*Post Septuagesiman; omissis Alleluia et Versu sequenti, dicitur;*

*Tractus. Ps. 39.* Hóstiam et oblatiónem noluisti, corpus autem aptásti mihi. *V.* In cápite libri scriptum est de me, ut fáciam, Deus, voluntátem tuam.

*Tempore Paschali, Omisso Graduali, dicitur;*

Alleúlia, alleúlia. *V. Ps. 8.* Beátus homo, qui audit me, et qui vigilat ad fores meas quotidi, et obsérvat ad postes óstii mei. Alleúlia. *V. Col. c. 3. 3.* Vita nostra est abscondita cum Christo in Deo. Alleúlia.

✠ *Sequéntia sancti Evangelii secúndum Lucam. Luc. 2.*

Cum factus esset Jesus annórum duodecim ascendéntibus illis Jerosólymam secundum consuetúdinem diéi festi, consummatisque diébus, cum redirent, remánsit puer Jesus in Jerúsalem, et non cognovérunt paréntes ejus. Existimántes autem illum esse in comitátu, venerunt iter diéi, et requirébant eum inter cognétos, et notos. Et non inveniéntes, regréssi sunt in Jerúsalem, requiréntes eum. Et factum est, post triduum invenérunt illum in templo, sedéntem in médio doctorum, audiéntem illos et interrogántem eos. Stupébant autem omnes, qui eum audiébant, super prudéntia et respónsis ejus. Et vidéntes admiráti sunt. Et dixit mater ejus ad illum: Fili, quid fecisti nobis sic? Ecce pater tuus, et ego, doléntes quaerebámus te. Et ait ad illos: Quid est quod me quaerebátis? Nesciebatis quia in his quæ Patris mei sunt opórtet me esse? Et ipsi non intellexerunt verbum, quod locútus est ad illis. Et descendit cum eis et venit Nazareth: et erat subditus illis. Et

mater ejus conservábat ómnia verba haec in corde suo. Et Jesus proficiébat sapiéntia, et aetáte et grátia apud deum, et hómines. Credo.

*Offertorium. Luc.* Tulérunt Jesum paréntes ejus in Jerusalem, ut sisterent eum Dómino.

SECRETA.

Placatiónis hóstiam offérimus tibi Domine, suppliciter deprecántes : ut, per intercessiÓNem Deiparae Virginis cum beato Joseph, familias nostras in pace et grátia tua firmiter constituas. Per.

*Praefatio de Nativitate.*

Communio. *Luc. 2.* Descéndit Jesus cum eis, et venit Názareth, et erat súbditus illis.

*Postcommunio.*

Quos coeléstibus réfcis Sacraméntis, fac, Dómine Jesu, sanctae Familiae tuae exémpa júgiter imitári : ut in hora mortis nostrae, occurrénte gloriósa Virgine Matre tua cum beato Joseph ; per te in aeterna tabernácula récipi mereámur : Qui vivis et regnas.

## BOOK REVIEW.

CODE DE PROCEDURE CANONIQUE DANS LES CAUSES MATRIMONALES. Par M. l'Abbe G. Peries, Docteur en Droit Canon, Prof. a l'Universite Cathol. de Washington, Membre de l'Academie de Saint-Raymond Pennafort.—Extract du *Canoniste Contemporain*. Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1894. XII, pp. VIII, 261.

It can hardly be said that the special subject of ecclesiastical jurisprudence which Prof. Péries presents to his readers has been neglected in modern theological literature. Mansella, Gasparri, Esmain, and, for the United States, Dr. Smith (not to mention the large number of writers who discuss the subject of canonical legislation concerning marriage in a wider sense) have, within the last few years, published exhaustive treatises *de processu judiciali* intended to serve as text-books or guides for those on whom it devolves to form a deciding and decisive judgment in such matters.

Nevertheless the present work possesses a distinctive merit by reason of its practical form. Whilst maintaining the scientific basis, upon which all canonical argument and action must proceed, the author disposes his subject-matter in a novel form, thoroughly analytical and therefore clear and easy of access for casual reference. He does not discuss the rules established by judicial authority or legitimate precedent or accepted custom, but he presents them in pithy paragraphic phrase, numbered, and with brief notes of explanation from authentic sources wherever the rule calls for illustration or exception.

Adhering to his primary purpose of furnishing the principles which serve in the solution and decision of doubts regarding the validity of the marriage-tie the author treats in the first part of his volume the "elements of the form" as distinguished from the "elements of the matter" which constitute the second part.

In 147 short articles or clauses of the first part we have a precise summary of the laws and principles determining the rights and limits of the juridical authority which takes cognizance of matrimonial causes. This includes the duties of the official participants in the trial, the methods to be followed in searching proofs, in delivering sentence and lodging legal appeal. The second and larger

portion of the volume treats of the special canons touching nullity of the marriage contract under its different aspects.

Whilst the author takes, as we glean from his introduction, a broad view of the application of Canon law to modern social circumstances he is by no means disposed to underrate the importance of a fixed norm of juridical procedure based upon the unalterable principles of our ancient ecclesiastical legislation.

We venture the suggestion that a good English version of this volume would meet with the approval of a large body of our clergy. The translator will, of course, have to make a few changes or omit certain articles such as those treating of *sponsalia* and *adoption*, the legal and practical bearing of which in America differs largely from the accepted code of France. The same might be said regarding the subject of *clandestinity*, although in a more limited sense. Short of these topics the work appeals directly to the practical sense of the American priest who by means of such a guide finds himself enabled quickly to locate the difficulty and apply the remedy in any case of doubt regarding the validity of a marriage. The addition of a *formulary* such as Joder's to which our author refers would make this a complete handbook of exceptional value for our clergy. There are a few misprints in the references.

**THE PERFECTION OF MAN BY CHARITY.**—A spiritual treatise. By H. Reginald Buckler, O. P.—(Second Edition.)—London: Burns & Oates. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros.

The work of our perfection lies in the development of our love. Tell me what a person loves and I will tell you the value of that person. Love is the rule and test of all advance in the spiritual, and we might add also in the temporal order. This is the lesson which Fr. Buckler's treatise illustrates and enforces. In doing so he holds fast to the doctrine of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure like to the two perpendicular side pieces of a ladder which keep the rungs leading on high in their places. The two books into which the volume is divided deal in the first part with the end and the need of the soul, and in particular of the soul called to the religious perfection. In the second part the character of charity is drawn out in its contrast with the natural, the philanthropic or or altruistic model of life; next the life of charity in its develop-

ment, activity and ultimate perfection is clearly limned, a picture which is calculated to rouse the aspirations of the soul taken by earth.

Many of our readers are no doubt already familiar with the work from its first edition, but we have had no opportunity to recommend its excellencies in our pages.

**CARMINA MARIANA.**—An English Anthology in Verse in honor of or in Relation to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected and arranged by Orby Shipley, M. A., editor of "Annus Sanctus." (Second edition.) Sold for the editor by Burns and Oates: London and New York. 1894.

It is a gratifying assurance of a healthy Catholic taste in English literature, that a new edition of this choice collection of verses in honor of our Blessed Lady should be demanded so soon after its first publication. The changes of this second issue are few but not unimportant. Apart from some typographical improvements an index of authors has been supplied. The editor also deemed it of interest to add certain extracts from leading Reviews which evinced independence of judgment concerning the object of the book or the estimate of individual contributions contained in it. We await with much interest the companion volume "Poema Domina" which is announced as preparing for publication.

**GREEN GRAVES IN IRELAND.** By Walter Lecky.—John Murphy & Co., Publishers, Baltimore.

This little book furnishes a text for a regret and for a well-assured hope. Many of the gifted men of whose lives and writings it treats are comparatively unknown to the great world of English letters. Outside of Ireland their works are read and their genius appreciated by a *clientèle* which, numerically considered, offers no fair criterion of their claims to popular favor. Indeed the grave would seem to have closed no more effectually upon their mortal remains than upon their literary life-work. This is our regret. Let us however take hope. The author reminds us that their graves are still green. The verdure above their dust is suggestive of a new Spring which many latter-day portents assure us is awaking. The Ireland of tradition and of history, of song and of story, of legend and of romance shall

no longer be a sealed book to the great world without her own insular confines. Year by year the book stalls in England and in America, especially during the holiday season, attest that the reading public are becoming interested in the folk-lore of a new land and of a new people ; that writers, many of them Irish only in sympathy, have discovered a new, unworked—we had almost said inexhaustible—mine of literary treasure ; and that publishers are found more willing to risk the expense of fine letter-press and binding in preparing these publications for the great international world of readers to whom they appeal, and whom they hope to interest. The establishment too, in London, of a new Irish Literary Society having for its founder and adviser the man who fifty years ago “brought a new soul into Ireland,” and gave to his country a national literature is a most hopeful augury for another and more permanent “Irish Renaissance.” We have no hesitation in saying that the little work which we introduce to our readers might deservedly take its place among the initial volumes of the “New Irish Library.” It is a compendium of short but racy biographies, dealing with the chief actors in the Irish national movement since the founding of the *Nation* newspaper in 1842 by Gavan Duffy. The volume contains papers on D. F. McCarthy, Mangan, “Leo,” O’Connell, Lord O’Hagan, Carleton, Davis and other Irish worthies.

The paper and type of the little volume are excellent ; surprisingly so, for the low price at which it may be procured. For the rest, we can say that Mr. Lecky’s style invests his subject with a charm which, we think, will induce the most unwilling reader who has opened his little book to persevere through its entire contents. Here and there we notice statements the biographical accuracy of which we question, notably in the sketch of Clarence Mangan. Mr. Lecky, however, is scarcely to be blamed for details that have been authenticated by men who, like Mitchell, were Mangan’s contemporaries. In a letter which is now before us Father Meehan, a short time before his lamented death, somewhat warmly denied that Mangan was an opium eater. He had already rejected this statement in a preface to Mangan’s “Poets and Poetry of Munster.” As to the poet’s “love episode” which constitutes so unfailing a subject for varied treatment by all Mangan’s recent biographers, Father Meehan’s story, as told to us by himself, seems the most natural and, coming from him, the most credible. Mangan, during the few years preceding 1832, gave lessons in the German language to a Miss H. Like any other tutor he was paid for his services.

All ideas of love and marriage were entirely one-sided ; for Miss H., while finding much to esteem in her gifted preceptor, yet met his protestations of affection with constant but good natured rebuke. This is the prosaic account by Mangan's most intimate friend, of a biographical story which like the poet's own autobiography must be considered as a veritable "Rève d'une Vie." But these few blemishes will be kindly glanced at for the many interesting facts Mr. Lecky has so well given, of men great, good and almost forgotten, but whose lives and labors as here shown are deserving of the attention and the gratitude at least of the Celtic race "all the world over."

J. G.

---

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

- PHILOSOPHIA NATURALIS.** In usum scholarum auctore Henr. Haan, S.J.—Friburgi Brisg. Sumptibus Herder. St. Louis, Mo. 1894. Pg. viii, 219. Pr. \$1.00.
- ONTOLOGIA, sive Metaphysica Generalis.** In usum scholarum. Auctore Carolo Frick, S.J.—Friburgi Brisg. B. Herder. 1894. Pg. viii, 204. Pr. \$1.00.
- EXPLANATION OF DEHARBE'S SMALL CATECHISM,** by James Canon Schmitt, D.D. Translated from the 7th German edition.—St. Louis, Mo. 1894. B. Herder. Pg. vi, 298. Pr. \$1.25.
- D. APOSTOLISCHE GLAUBENSBEKENNTNISS.** Apologetisch-geschichtliche Studie. Von Clemens Blum, S.J.—Freiburg Br. B. Herder. Pg. xvi, 304. Pr. \$1.15.
- LETTERS OF ST. ALPHONSUS MARIA DE LIGOURI.** General Correspondence, Vol. iii. From the German by Rev. Eugene Grimm.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Bros. 1894. Pg. xxvii, 504. Pr. \$1.25.
- DANTE'S DIVINA COMMEDIA.** Its scope and value. From the German of Franz Hettinger, D.D. Edited by Henry Sebastian Bowden, of the Oratory. Second edition, revised.—London : Burns & Oates. (N. Y. Benziger Bros.) 1894.
- ST. THOMAS' PRIORY,** or the Story of St. Austin's, Stafford. By Joseph Gillow.—London : Burns & Oates.
- PILATE'S WIFE.** A Tale of the Time of Christ. By Richard T. Haywarden.—London : Burns & Oates.
- LIFE OF THE PRINCESS BORGHESE.** By LeChevalier Zeloni. Translated by Lady Martin.—London : Burns & Oates.
- CATALOGUE OF THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL EXHIBIT.** Worlds Columbian Exposition.—Chicago. 1893. (Revised edition.)
- THE MEANS OF GRACE.** A complete exposition of the Seven Sacraments, etc., illustrated by numerous parables, examples, etc. From the German of Rev. Herman Rolfus, D.D., and Rev. F. J. Braendle, by Rev. Richard Brennan, L.L.D.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Bros. 1894.



# AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

---

VOL. X.—JUNE, 1894.—No. 6.

---

## CLERICAL STUDIES.

### TWENTY-FIRST ARTICLE.

### ASCETIC THEOLOGY.

THE Christian life admits, as all know, of numberless degrees, from the most imperfect beginnings to the heights of holiness reached by the saints. In its earlier stages it is a matter of strict obligation; beyond, it leads away the soul from the region of fear into that of freedom and love. In all its parts it falls within the province of moral theology, understood broadly as dealing with the practical side of Christianity. But, as commonly understood, moral theology confines itself to what is obligatory; the rest—the higher life—becomes the object of a special, complementary science which takes the name of ascetic theology.

#### I.

The name itself is borrowed from those fervent Christians who in early times withdrew from the world to give themselves up to a life of austerity and prayer. Their exercises of self-discipline won for them the designation of *ἀσκήται*, a name indeed suited to all the followers of Christ, for asceticism is, in a certain degree, an essential element of His teaching, and obligatory on all Christians; but the most conspicuous practices of such a life being optional, the name has gradually come to be reserved to that more exalted form of virtue which is left to the free choice of each individual.

Ascetic theology, then, is the science of the higher Chris-

tian life. Starting from the humble level of faithfulness to strict duty, it undertakes "to show a more excellent way,"—onward and upward through the evangelical virtues and counsels, to the loftiest summits which human nature sustained by grace can attain to, thus containing the theory and practice of Christian perfection, or, as it is more commonly called, of a spiritual—or a devout—or a holy life. Mystical theology, as commonly understood, is something higher still, but as the expression is used in various senses, it may not be amiss to point them out in order to avoid confusion of thought.

First of all the term *asceticism* and mysticism are often used indiscriminately to designate the higher Christian life in all its forms. Hence certain writers embrace the whole subject of the present paper under the name of mystical instead of ascetical theology. Others, writing from a philosophical or rationalistic standpoint, give the title of mystical to whatever in religion is unverifiable by experience or undemonstrable by reason. Thus all direct intercourse with God, the sacramental system as productive of supernatural effects, the whole economy of grace, prayer, all belong in their conception to the region of mysticism, that is, according to the rationalist view, of unreality. But, as commonly understood by spiritual writers, mysticism means something different which shall be best understood by comparing it with ascetic theology.

Ascetic theology, as we shall see, is based upon reason and faith. Taking its departure from the data supplied by both, it builds up a system of life perfectly consistent and logical in all its parts, and fairly within the range of human effort sustained by grace. It is a philosophy of life as seen in the light of revelation, of the conscience, and of the common experience of men.

Mystical theology, on the contrary, is intuitive, not argumentative. Contemplation is its home;—a vision of God beyond what reason or ordinary faith can supply. It may be won, in a lower degree, by certain more favored souls through special methods; but in its higher forms it is a pure gift

from above, clearly manifesting the agency of powers distinct from the natural faculties. In this intercourse with God the soul finds a manner of spiritual enlightenment transcending all human knowledge, a practical wisdom beyond that of the wisest, an unflagging, irresistible energy to carry out the divine purposes. To these favors are not unfrequently added signs more unmistakable still of the divine action: revelations, visions, ecstasies, strange bodily experiences, stigmata and the like. All such facts are outside the province of ascetics; they constitute a science of their own: the science of mystical theology.

We shall have something to say of both in what follows, especially of the former;—of its usefulness, of its methods, and of its manifold sources.

## II.

The value of the science of ascetic theology is so very obvious from its very definition that it need not be dwelt upon at any great length. The higher Christian life is the noblest and greatest thing in the world. Its principles and its laws are of more importance to the Christian than all other philosophies and legislations, its methods more important to know than those by which fame is won and wealth accumulated. For the priest it is a necessity. It is his own law of life, to begin with. The sacredness of his character and the nearness in which he is placed to God by his functions make it a duty for him to live up to the spirit of Christ and to show it forth in his daily life. The heights are his natural dwelling place, the region in which it behooves him "to live and move and have his being." This he owes to God and to himself, so that already for his own guidance he has to be familiar with the methods and rules of the higher law.

But he also owes it to others;—to the faithful at large who instinctively turn to the life and listen to the words of the priest in order to gather from them the true meaning of the Gospel; still more to those who have been in any degree entrusted to his priestly care.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that a pastor has to teach his people only their essential duties. It is the whole divine message that he is bound to deliver to them, "teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever* I have commanded you" (Mat. xxvii), the Beatitudes as well as the Decalogue, the various methods of devotion and practices of love, as well as the humblest and most elementary forms of moral obligations. True, it is neither necessary nor expedient that the teachings of the pastor should go beyond the practical aptitude and possibilities of his hearers. But although the latter may be very limited in most, they are by no means so in all. Indeed the pastor may take it for granted that among the number of those committed to his care, there are always some, often many, susceptible of a higher degree of spiritual culture and capable, if only properly taught, of practising in no ordinary degree the Christian virtues. There may be actually among them souls susceptible, under proper guidance, of the highest forms of holiness. And a conclusive proof of all this may be found in the fact that a growth of such heavenly fruits springs into life and ripens in almost every field cultivated by an enlightened and zealous priest. The seed was there and needed only to be properly cultivated; elsewhere it is equally present, but dies for lack of care.

The reason of this lies on the surface. The transformation of the natural into the spiritual life is simple enough in its general principles, but these principles have to be known and realized, and that comes only through teaching. Even when clearly understood as abstract truths, they have to be brought down to the concrete and applied to all the particulars of daily life; a task complex, confusing and entirely beyond the powers of ordinary people. Only by deep reflection or by lengthened experience, or by a manifest illumination from above could it be performed, and all these are almost invariably wanting in them. Hence it comes to pass that the first impulse of souls awakened to a sense of their evil condition or the claims of God upon them and anxious to respond to the divine call, is to look around them for guidance and eagerly to grasp the hand stretched out to help them. This

is what gathered so many of the early Christians around the cells of the great anchorites. Led on by the spirit of God to something higher, yet knowing not where to find or how to embrace it, they turned for guidance to these men of God, and found it in such abundance that many of them chose to live and die beside those who had made so plain to them the will of God and the way to heaven.

And so has it been in all subsequent ages. The first impulse of the saints themselves was to seek the direction of others more experienced in the ways and workings of divine grace. Nor is it otherwise at the present day. All those who are moved to do their best in the service of God crave for more light; and if, after having felt its beneficent rays, they have been deprived of it, how they watch and pray that it may be borne back to them by some other enlightened and holy priest! And if he comes, how quickly his presence is felt! What a visible, rapid growth of fervor and purity of life in the community at large, especially in its chosen members, and how all rejoice to walk in the light of a fuller knowledge of things divine!

Since, then, the spiritual enlightenment of a parish, and the piety it leads to, are so entirely dependent on these qualities being possessed by the pastor, in a degree corresponding to his superior dignity and influence, it follows that a knowledge of the higher Christian life is as much a part of his intellectual equipment as any other form of knowledge, and that the more thorough he makes it, the better he is fitted for his work.

We have now to consider how this may be best effected.

### III.

Acquaintance with the elements of the spiritual life begins in a Catholic almost with reason itself, and in a priest it should naturally grow to the very end of his existence. But in this unceasing growth we may distinguish three principal stages: the first, which is common to him with the faithful; the second, corresponding with the period of his seminary

preparation for the priesthood; the third, comprising the whole time of his active ministry. Now it would seem that each one of these stages admits of and, in some measure, calls for a special development of spiritual knowledge which it may not be amiss to point out more distinctly.

(1) In connection with the first, we may call attention to the fact of the wonderful facility with which the things of the spiritual life are realized in childhood and in early youth. The special plasticity of the mind at that early period, its natural docility and trustfulness, its promptness to take in the broad, simple aspects and issues of life, as presented by faith, without any of the qualifications which later on grow out of reflection and experience, all help to make the youthful mind the natural recipient of divine teaching and place it in close, living contact with the unseen. The strong, clear hold which children sometimes get of the fundamental Christian truths and of their logical consequences is simply marvelous and makes one instinctively repeat with our Lord: "I give thanks to Thee, O Father, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and shown them to little ones." (Mat. xi, 25.)

A love for such mental and spiritual nutriment seeking to satisfy itself in books of devotion, particularly in the "Lives of the Saints," is an ordinary feature of Catholic piety, and often leads the youthful aspirant to a considerable knowledge of what belongs to the spiritual life, long before he has begun his preparation for the priesthood. Indeed the knowledge thus acquired through reading and listening, in public and in private, is in itself a most suitable introduction to what is to follow, leading as it does without effort to that early familiarity with the maxims of the Gospel, the examples of the Saints and the habits and practices of a devout life so much more difficult to acquire at a later period.

(2) The second stage is one of especial importance. Those who enter upon it are very unequally prepared; some, like those we have just referred to, being already familiar with the principal doctrines of the spiritual life, whilst others are almost entire strangers to them. But even the most enlight-

ened have much more to learn, both for their own guidance, in view of their great prospective responsibilities, and for the guidance of others.

This is the object, during the years of their probation, of an uninterrupted course of reading, instructions and devotional exercises. There are two things which should be steadily aimed at by those who impart and by those who gather in such instructions: definiteness and solidity. The frequent absence of these two essential qualities arises from the loose, informal manner in which the spiritual doctrines are frequently taught, especially during the previous period. They come in the shape of meditations, exhortations, pious readings and the like, the object of which is not so much to enlighten the mind as to awaken and exalt the feelings. The exact nature, the various degrees and the proper limitations of the Christian virtues are often implied rather than clearly explained, and their solid foundations are neglected or buried out of sight under a pile of spurious authorities, misinterpreted texts or unconclusive, sophistical reasons.

The natural remedy for such defects would be to consider and deal with ascetic theology as a science, in the strict sense of the expression, having like every other form of accurate knowledge, its established notions, its definite doctrines, its principles, demonstrations and deductions, solidly established and proof against all manner of objections.

(*a*)—This would imply, first of all, a careful study of the principal component elements of the spiritual life; the end, the obstacles, the methods, the principal means. After a general classification of the virtues, each one of them would have to be considered individually in itself, in its bearing upon the others, in the position which it holds in the general economy of Christian perfection.

(*b*)—In the study of the opposite vices, a method might be followed somewhat similar to that which medical men apply to the different forms of disease, determining as nearly as possible for each one, its causes, its symptoms, its various forms of development, and, when unchecked, the final issue it leads to. The therapeutic side would naturally follow,

showing how to deal with the evil at each of its stages ; how to temper and, if possible, to eradicate it.

(c)—Next there would be room for a general investigation of the methods and practices which authority, reason or experience indicate as the most effective means of correction or improvement ; such as self-examination, prayer, devotional reading, confession, Communion, pious or penitential practices, etc. One of the most important things to show in a general way at this period is the manner in which the maxims of the Gospel may be harmonized with the requirements of practical life. The manner in which they are sometimes presented begets a sense of unreality most prejudicial to them.

Finally these various elements might be disposed in a logical order so as to form a system harmonious and consistent in all its parts.

All this has been repeatedly attempted by systematic writers on ascetic theology, such as Schram, Scaramelli, Morotius, etc., etc., and their works cannot but prove useful to the student. Yet, in the present as in most other cases, nothing can equal in practical usefulness what each one does for himself.

(3)—Not much more can be attempted during the course of studies preparatory to the priesthood. It is in the constant labor and varied experience of the ministry that the developments and the details of the science will come, as it were, of themselves in the solid framework prepared for them. What was originally done on trust and in obedience to a mechanical rule will come to be practised in the light of a direct intuitional view of things. Principles brought into contact with their correlative facts will work themselves out and assume their ultimate form. Methods made fully intelligible by observation and comparison will be properly applied. Only thus can the science of the higher life complete itself as a theory.

But its principal development is practical. It consists in the application of the maxims of the Gospel to the details of human life. For it is in this that Christian perfection con-



sists ;—not in a given number of distinct actions of an exceptional kind, but in the lifting up of the whole existence, with its humblest and most commonplace particulars, to a higher level ; —in a turning of the whole man to God. Rules and methods abound for this purpose in ascetic writers, but they can be mastered, like all rules of art, only by assiduous and lengthened practice, in addition to a constant study of the rules themselves. Hence it is that the best guides of souls, like the ablest medical practitioners, are always learners, are always learning, learning from books, old and new ; learning above all from the thoughtful consideration of the facts which come unceasingly under their notice.

For it cannot be repeated too often, experience,—constant, enlightened observation of the moral and spiritual facts of life, of the workings of nature and grace, in self and in others, is the school from which most is to be learned. And then, beyond it there is the still broader knowledge of human nature, of the soul in its general conditions and laws and in its manifold varieties. The knowledge of human nature is as much the business of the spiritual guide as it is of the psychologist or of the student of social sciences. It is as essential in the spiritual sphere as a knowledge of the human body is to the physician. If conspicuously absent, the consequence is at once felt in the shape of impossible aims, unpractical rules and injudicious methods. It is not to man in the abstract that the Gospel maxims have to be applied ; it is to the concrete individual, with all the individual peculiarities of age, race, temperament, and the like. It is not to man considered in himself and isolated from all else ; it is to man as a social being, living amid all manner of varying environments and bound to his fellow-men by numberless ties, visible and invisible. For this manner of knowledge, the spiritual guide has to wait : but if he keeps his eyes open to facts and his mind to reflection it grows unceasingly and almost unconsciously within him.

## IV.

The preceding remarks apply chiefly to ascetic theology which remains almost entirely within the range of ordinary experience and develops in harmony with the normal laws of the human soul, leading it on through "the purgative and illuminative to the unitive way,"—that is, through the purifying process of atonement and subjugation of the passions, and through the practice of the positive Christian virtues, to a life of love and union with God. But what, it may be asked, shall be the study, still more, what can be the *science* of facts foreign to ordinary experience and independent of regular laws, such as those which constitute the mystical life?

It must be confessed that the whole subject of mystical theology is surrounded with difficulties. There is something so irregular and so evanescent in most of the facts that it is hard to make an accurate, comparative study of them. Their strangeness is often perplexing, and their very origin a problem not always easy to solve. Unusual facts, like in appearance, may be occasionally traced back to the most unlike causes;—to the Spirit of God or to the evil spirit, or simply to the natural though abnormal condition of the faculties. On the other hand, their independence of the will almost forbids the attempt to reduce them to anything like method and rule.

Nevertheless the attempt has been made. Side by side with the ascetic, there has been always a mystical school in the Catholic Church, with its traditions, its principles and its rules. Some of the greatest saints have been its doctors, and the study of their writings is one of the greatest delights of many holy souls. In our next paper we shall have to refer to them more explicitly. From now we may remark that the guide of souls should not be a stranger to them. The contemplative school indeed was never more than a minority in the Church, and never, perhaps, was that minority smaller than in this busy age of ours. Yet even in our day, not only in the cloister but in the world, there are souls that are led

by that higher way to God. There are many, besides, who, while habitually guided by the rules and sustained by the methods of ascetic theology, are occasionally lifted up to the higher order; and there are many more who carry within them habitually a mystical element which has to be taken into account in their spiritual direction. In the mystical sphere direction has to be far less positive and detailed than in the other. It consists principally in that discernment by which the spiritual guide discriminates the real character of the aspirations and impulses which lead the soul under his guidance, applying the injunction of the great Mystic among the Apostles, S. John—(I, iv, 1): “Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God.” This question once settled, as it may be soon enough in most cases without much trouble, especially by applying the evangelical rule;—“by their fruits ye shall know them”—the rest is simple enough. It consists principally in seeing that the impulse, divine in its origin, does not degenerate, and that the soul to whatever heights it may be carried never fails or falters in the fundamental and essential virtues of faith, humility, obedience and brotherly love.

The next paper will be devoted to the sources of ascetic theology.

J. HOGAN.

*Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.*

---

#### THE PERPETUAL PRESENCE AND PONTIFICATE OF ST. PETER IN ROME.

THERE is a passage in the poetry of St. Prosper of Aquitaine, which refers to the subject of this article, and expresses in the briefest possible manner its underlying, momentous truth:—

Sedes Roma Petri, quae Pastoralis honoris,  
Facta caput mundo, quidquid non possidet armis  
Relligione tenet.

In this pregnant phrase of the fifth century Saint, the world-

wide sovereignty of St. Peter is rightly based upon his pastoral office. Both imply his presence in Rome; and we know from the experience of ages, and from the revelation, made in the fulness of time, of decrees uttered before the ages began, that this presence is perpetual, "throughout all days, until the consummation of the world."

Let us consider the historical fact of St. Peter's material presence in Rome, since it is the beginning of his perpetual spiritual presence. It has been proved again and again, proved moreover in the most decisive way, by citing the calm and reasoned conclusions of the most learned Protestants and Freethinkers, such as Cave, Hammond, Pearson, Grotius, Usher, Chamier, Newton, Blondel, Junius, Joseph Scaliger, Pappius, Kipping, Bebel, Ittigius, and John Le Clerc. But it has also been redented, though not by minds of the same quality, and the denial will also probably be made perpetual in the narrow interests of sects, religious and anti-religious. It is not, however, for this alone, if at all, that it is well to ponder on the old evidences for the mighty fact; it is because of the mighty consequences dependent upon it.

We should here recall the fact that the early Christians wrote little; as Fleury says,<sup>1</sup> they were men of action, forgetful of self and zealous only for the spreading of the Gospel, which was for the most part best done by word of mouth. Secular historians made none but the slightest and most casual mention of Christian events. Such Christian literature as existed suffered terrible loss in the persecutions, notably in Diocletian's; much was consumed in the Barbarian devastations. It is little matter for marvel, therefore, and still less evidence against the fact, that we have no contemporary mention of St. Peter's being in Rome. I except, of course, St. Peter's own words. No other contemporarily written record is at hand; but a Roman, who was the disciple of St. Peter, has left us a record. St. Clement of Rome, his early if not his immediate successor, in the first and undoubtedly genuine letter to the Corinthians speaks thus of the lives of Sts. Peter and Paul: "These men, instituting holy

1 "Discours sur l'Histoire Ecclésiastique," p. 28-29.

living, gathered to them a great number of elect, and, through envy, suffering admirably, dwelt among us (ἐγενοντο ἐν ἡμῖν).<sup>1</sup> That St. Peter should have lived here, implies his material presence no less clearly than his working here implies the exercise of the primacy.

St. Peter had been dead about fifty years when St. Ignatius of Antioch suffered martyrdom. In a well authenticated letter addressed to the Romans, he said: "Not as Peter and Paul do I command these things to you."<sup>2</sup> Ignatius was not the pastor of the first See; Peter had been its regular Bishop and Paul had been delegated with extraordinary powers. They taught with local and therefore absolute authority; St. Ignatius spoke as a Christian Bishop and as a brother in the faith.

I omit the testimony of Papias, because the precise date of his life is doubtful, although he was probably a disciple of St. John the Evangelist.

Polycarp was certainly a disciple of St. John, and Irenaeus was a disciple of Polycarp. Irenaeus in two places distinctly states that SS. Peter and Paul founded the Church at Rome, and that they preached the Gospel in that city.<sup>3</sup>

There is a fourth witness who lived within a century of St. Peter's death. This is St. Dionysius, the celebrated Bishop of Corinth, who, in his Epistle to the Romans, says that SS. Peter and Paul taught both in Rome and Corinth and founded the Church of Christ in both places.<sup>4</sup>

The main idea in these clear texts of the Fathers, which are too well known to require our citing them in detail, is that St. Peter *founded* the Church in Rome. Hence, if the continuity of pastors be uninterrupted, the entire succession begins with him and depends upon him. Fortunately, in no case has the record of the Bishops of a See been better preserved and so perfectly transmitted to posterity as in that of the See of Rome. The unbroken succession of the Roman Pontiffs is one of the most prominent facts of history. Two historical authorities supply us with their names and actions:

1 Cl. Rom. ad Cor. i., 5, apocr.

3 Iren. iii., 3; adv. haer. i., 20.

2 Ign. ad Rom., c. iv.

4 Apud Euseb. H. E. ii., 25.

the writings of the Fathers, such as Irenaeus, Optatus, Augustine and Epiphanius, and the catalogues written early in the era of peace. Innumerable collateral proofs are to be found in the inscriptions and other evidences of antiquity which have been discovered at later times, after having been hidden for centuries, and therefore saved from destruction and fraud.

Now in the writings of both the Pre-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, one fact is brought out in the strongest relief, namely, the connection of the Roman Bishops with the founder of the See. These sacred writers cannot think of the Bishop of Rome without reverting to St. Peter, the first of the long line. Hence St. Ambrose's well known phrase, *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia*, and hence also St. Augustine says that "Christ entrusted His entire flock to the pastoral care of the Roman pontiff in the person of St. Peter."

These instances could be greatly multiplied; they are but specimens of a numerous class. Now why should the Bishop of Rome always and inevitably suggest St. Peter and his pastoral office? The Bishops of historic Sees are often associated with the honor of the first Bishop, generally an Apostle, and often a martyr or saint. Thus, the Archbishop of Lyons is associated with St. Irenaeus, and the Primate of Armagh with St. Patrick. But the actual occupants of even the most historic Sees could never be regarded as the living representatives of the first Bishops of those Sees and as possessing their authority *as such*. It is quite different in this case. Whenever the early Christian writers associate St. Peter and his successors in the Roman See, they deem it not sufficient to state that the Roman Pontiffs were the successors of St. Peter, but they speak of the office of St. Peter as a present thing, because it is in its nature perpetual, just as the eternity of the Godhead is expressed in the Scriptures by the present tense, *I am who am*.

It was during the Patristic age that the Roman empire was transferred to the East. Even in every-day life the most obviously natural facts pass without explanation. Of the moral motives of this momentous fact written contemporary

history makes a mystery, while the events of later history resolve it. The transfer of the seat of empire is the most abrupt solution of historical continuity that is known; it was a cruel, unreasonable and fatal act, unless it was the surrender of the city to the unceasing rule of St. Peter.

From the abundant proofs which mediæval history supplies in support of our thesis, it is only possible to consider two in this place, one of which is a written evidence, the other a testimony of fact. The first is the sentiment of the times, which regards each living Pope as the representative of St. Peter; the second is to be found in the very vicissitudes of the Popes.

As to the opinion held regarding the Popes during the Middle Ages, there is no better instance than that of England, the more so because it contrasts strangely with her change of attitude in later ages. England chose St. Peter for her great protector, and page after page of her mediæval literature attests her recognition of the living presence of St. Peter in each successive Pope.<sup>1</sup>

The vicissitudes of the Popes have been made to point many a moral. One thing is certain: if continual and consummate disaster did not succeed in severing the Popes from their See, nor their universal sovereignty from their position, the perpetuity of their attributes is set in high relief. Ambition and other moving forces of royal rule, which constituted the strongest human power of the Middle Ages, most frequently employed both military force and popular will to diminish and destroy the perpetual Pontificate of St. Peter. Cardinal Manning has given a succinctly graphic, though incomplete sketch of the vicissitudes of the Popes, in his book called "*The Last Glories of the Holy See.*"<sup>2</sup>

"Pope Liberius was banished by an heretical Emperor.

"Silverius died in Exile.

<sup>1</sup> On this point see the excellent pamphlet by his Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, published last June on the occasion of the consecration of England.

<sup>2</sup> Lecture I, page 20.

“Virgilius was imprisoned and exiled.

“St. Martin died in exile, a martyr.

“St. Leo III was driven out to Spoleto.

“Leo V was dethroned, and cast into prison.

“John XII had to fly from Rome.

“Benedict V was carried off into Germany.

“John XIII fled from a Roman faction, and took refuge in Capua.

“Benedict VI was imprisoned and murdered by a Roman faction.

“John XIV was cast into the prison of St. Angelo, and died of hunger.

“Gregory V was compelled to fly from Rome by a civil tumult.

“Benedict VIII was driven from Rome by a faction.

“Benedict IX was twice driven from Rome.

“Leo IX was dethroned by the Normans.

“St. Gregory VII went from land to land, and from kingdom to kingdom, and died in exile.

“Victor III could not so much as take possession of his See, and died at Beneventum.

“Urban II was restored by the French Crusaders.

“Pascal II was carried off by Henry V and imprisoned.

Gelasius II was compelled to fly to Gaeta, which city enjoys the glorious prerogative of having repeatedly been the refuge of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

“Honorius II was compelled to fly into France, by an anti-pope who usurped his See.

“Eugenius III was driven out of Rome by Arnold of Brescia.

“Alexander III on the very day of his consecration, was cast into prison. He was consecrated, not in the holy city, but in a village church. He was obliged to fly into the mountains for safety. He passed seven years wandering from Terracina to Anagni, from Anagni to Tusculum.

“Urban III and Gregory VIII could not even take possession of Rome.

“Lucius III fled to Verona.



“Gregory IX was compelled by an Insurrection at Rome to retire to Perugia.

“Innocent IV fled to Genoa.

“Alexander IV fled to Viterbo.

“Martin IV never entered Rome.

“Boniface VIII was a prisoner at Anagni.

. . . . .

“Urban VI fled to Genoa.

“Innocent VII fled from the factions of Rome to Viterbo.

“Gregory XI fled to Gaeta.

“John XXIII fled from Rome.

“Eugenius IV was besieged in his own palace by an anti-pope and was obliged to fly to Florence.”<sup>1</sup>

When the brutal action of opposing force had failed in its purpose, the voluntary retirement of the Popes themselves seemed to have achieved what violence was unable to effect. A new Babylonian captivity was begun in the beautiful residence of Avignon. But scarcely had the factions been dissolved when a new plague broke out in a worse form, that of the Western Schism. This was adjusted as was the preceding one, in the natural sequence of unforeseen facts, another proof that the Pontificate of St. Peter in Rome was inevitable, necessary, and perpetual. Martin V reigned and was laid to rest; and on his tomb-slab in “*the head and mother of all the Churches*” he was designated “*felicitas sui temporis.*” Thus the last and greatest evil which afflicted Mediæval Christendom, came to a blessed conclusion, which put the seal of divine condemnation forever upon the attempts of future generations to shatter the perpetual rule of St. Peter. Yet the inexorable divine Law which permits continual affliction as the medium of continual glory, allowed the unreasoning and fatal Reformation. Northern Christendom was in revolt; Southern Christendom was ener-

<sup>1</sup> From the revolt of Novatian in 254 to the last schism in 1439, there have been twenty-six local schisms caused by the creations of anti-popes. Dr. Döllinger thought he had discovered one even earlier than 254; while there have been twenty-eight long delays between the deaths and elections of Popes. Burius “*Rom. Pont.*” sections xxii and xxiii.

vated; it was the result of a state of things wherein evil always asserts itself more powerfully than good.

Notwithstanding that the essence of the movement was opposition to the See of St. Peter, that See triumphed in the Counter-Reformation in Europe and in the spread of its allegiance over wide and newly discovered continents.

Certain facts of that misnamed century summarize in a striking way the fury of the opposition made and the strength of the meek conquering power, the conflict and the victory. The German religious revolution coincided in its most intense period with the siege of Rome by the Constable de Bourbon, the most terrible record of which has been left on the pages of history. Whilst the Augustinian Luther proclaims his apostacy, another Augustinian, St. Thomas of Villanova, steps into the arena as champion of the Catholic faith, working unto edification, not destruction. The revolt of Luther was mighty in all the power of flesh and blood; but it was counteracted by the Institute of the Society of Jesus, founded upon the inspirations of a martial but spiritual Catholicism. Thousands of Catholics were led into defection in Germany, but meanwhile St. Francis Xavier baptized a million infidels in India with his own hand.

The success of the Catholic revival and its relation to the Central See here has been generally acknowledged by Protestant historians, such as Lord Macauley in his review of Ranke's *History of the Popes*.

It is plain that if the presence and rule of St. Peter remained uninterrupted and victorious, their existence and victory cannot be attributed to any absence of persistent opposition.

Even traditionally faithful France, glorying in her proud title as the eldest daughter of the Church of Rome, did not preserve that peace and submission which might have been expected from her. To the Protestantism of Germany and England she added the third factious element of Gallicanism. Its opposition was the more dangerous because it attacked the living personality and prerogatives of St. Peter, denying him that plenitude of authority which was ever accorded to

the Roman See, and which the Council of the Vatican has since then declared to be of the faith.

Yet here again the triumph was with St. Peter. The most prominent actions which signalize the relations of the Papacy with France since the revolutionary era clearly mark the unceasing victory which is the privilege of Peter. The old Gallicanism was impotent to restrain the Revolution, which destroyed both the throne that had been its idol, and the servile Church which had paid it homage. On the wreck of the old Church and State the Papacy erected a new Church and blessed the democratic State which had recognized its sovereignty; and the contrast between the efficiency of the Pontificate in repairing the evils and the incapacity of the national Church in preventing them, is a strong and typical proof of the saving power of the Holy See.

It is, moreover, notable that in every struggle the material advantages had been on the side of those who were eventually vanquished, yet when the paternal spiritual authority of Rome seemed insufficient to stem the tide of evil, historical circumstances turned somehow to the support of the rightful power.

The war waged against St. Peter's living action in our own day has not been so much, as in past ages, about questions of dogma. It has been sought to turn the strong influence of facts against the old See. Modern infidelity necessarily busies itself but little with the doctrinal questions whether Peter really received the commission of the keys, and whether he exercised that power throughout the ages. Its action has been practical and more precise. Without taking the trouble to question its prerogatives it has ingeniously determined first to make the Roman See captive, and then to utterly destroy it, or if this be impossible—the hypothesis is marvelous, but I am quoting textually from an official document—to reduce the Bishop of Rome to the condition of an ordinary Bishop, and to make reaction impossible by the unchristianizing of his titular diocese.

From the early Mediæval time down to the sixteenth century very much of the warfare against St. Peter's See had

been concerned with the temporal power. And the greater the effort in each case, the greater has been the success of the Holy See. Those who hope to effect the overthrow of the Holy See now, forgetting that similar efforts have been always unsuccessful under more favorable conditions, are simply ignoring the teaching of history. Nor can it be objected that those who recognize the continual failure of such attacks take for their measure of success purely spiritual principles. It is true that Catholics do account for it in this way. But any candid thinker will admit that a fact which has occurred hundreds of times, under every variety of circumstances, cannot be dependent upon what the world calls chance, but must rest upon some fixed law—a law which is not likely to cease acting with equal consistency in the future.

Our concern in this article has been with the perpetual presence and pontificate of St. Peter in Rome. A regular succession of unquestionable facts has revealed that St. Peter is present in his See of Rome—as in life, so after death. To assert the presence of St. Peter is to assert his pontificate, for where Peter is, there is the Church, and he is the Church's head, and we cannot discern his presence without discerning his abiding pastoral rule.

It is not strange that the thought of the Papal sovereignty, as it has survived and conquered every obstacle, inevitably leads to the consideration of the politico-religious question of the temporal power, the attack against which is the most concrete expression of the spirit which would impede the action and life of the great See. This close connection shows that the question of the temporal power is really a vital religious question.

In Rome St. Peter is the *genius loci*; one feels instinctively that all spiritual and temporal power in the holy city belong to him. But the power which has its rightful centre there, not less rightfully radiates over the entire world. The most energetic resistance to the struggle of the spirit of evil against this sacred fact was made by St. Gregory VII, to whose birth and death two characteristic legends cling. When a mere child, playing with the pieces of wood in his father's work-

shop, he formed the prophetic verse of David: *Dominabitur a mari usque ad mare.*<sup>1</sup> And when he was about to die he uttered the famous words: "*Dilexi justitiam, et odivi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio.*" To which a Bishop present at his deathbed answered: "*Non potes Domine in exilio mori; quia in Vice Christi et Apostolorum ejus, divinitus accepisti gentes haereditatem, possessionem terminos terrae.*"<sup>2</sup> The words recall St. Bernard's to Eugenius III: "*Orbe exeundum ei, qui forte volet explorare, quae non ad tuam pertinent curam.*"

An unlimited sphere of Government, determined and unceasing warfare from the spirit of evil, ultimate and complete victory are the unchanging destiny of the See of St. Peter.

WILLIAM J. D. CROKE.

Rome, Italy.

---

THE FACULTY "LARGIENDI TER IN ANNO INDULGENTIAM."

AMONG the faculties granted through the Bishops to the missionary clergy of the United States and other countries the following is to be found: *Largiendi ter in anno indulgentiam plenariam contritis, confessis ac sacra communione refectis.*

The interpretation and practical manner of applying this privilege has given rise to much doubt and discussion, whilst the uncertainty of its meaning has made it in many cases a dead letter.

The queries are: Is this Indulgence to be imparted

a. In the confessional?

b. To individuals (*distributive*)? or to the faithful of a district, parish or mission?

<sup>1</sup> Berti: Eccl. Hist. Brev., vol. ii, pp. 46-7, and Ciace, Hist. Pont. Rom., vol. i, p. 855.

<sup>2</sup> Ciace, Hist. Pont. Rom. vol. i, p. 854-855.

- c. *Thrice* in the sense that its bestowal on the part of the priest is limited to that number? or that each recipient may avail himself thrice of the privilege?
- d. At stated times fixed by the Bishop? or at any opportune time according to the judgment of the individual, who enjoys the Faculty.
- e. By each of the assistants in a parish? or by the pastor only?
- f. Applicable "pro defunctis"? or not?
- g. Under condition that the faithful visit a church? or is this visit optional, since no mention is made of it as a requisite for gaining the Indulgence, in the Faculty?

The importance of a definite knowledge on these points is apparent at first sight if this Faculty is to be used.

In its general character the Indulgence here spoken of is similar to that of the Forty Hours' Adoration, and may be applied in like manner. The S. Congregation declares that the Faculty does not authorize a priest to grant the Indulgence to individuals, distributively, but that it is to be imparted collectively on three days during the year, designated for that purpose either by the Bishop or with his sanction by the pastor.<sup>1</sup> The *three times* during the year, however, need not be taken literally to mean three *days* only. The opportunity for gaining each Indulgence may be extended to a triduum or an octave, if all a parish or mission could not for some good reason avail themselves of the privilege on any one day. The Bishop may assign a fixed day three times a year, for all the churches and communities of his diocese, so as to unite the entire body of the faithful in a

<sup>1</sup> Utrum concessio Indulgentiæ *ter in anno* intelligi debeat distributive per annum fidelibus singulatim ad opportunitatem impertienda, an tribus per annum præscriptis diebus communitè elargienda ad normam consuetæ praxis in Ecclesia.—S. C. de Prop. Fid. 31 Jan., 1796, respondit: *Negative* ad primam partem; *affirmative* ad secundam.

common celebration of some local feast like the anniversary of a titular saint, of the dedication of the Cathedral, or of the Episcopal consecration. Or else he may appoint days for each church in succession, commemorating the patron feast, the days and seasons of local or special devotion, etc. The sole restriction under this head is that the indulgence may not be published oftener than three times during the year in the same place. To the question “an debeat (Episcopus) assignare eosdemmet dies pro tota simul dioecesi, vel potius possit designare diversos respective dies pro singulis seorsim ac successive parochiis, missionibus aut districtibus, ita ut fideles modo unius, modo alterius, et sic successive omnium, possint in sua quique Ecclesia praedictam Indulgentiam ter in anno lucrari diebus ab episcopo pro illo districtu designatis, licet diversi sint a designatis pro alio districtu?” the answer was given: “Non teneri, sed posse assignare diversos dies pro diversis parochiis seu missionibus, *dummodo non sint in eodem loco.*” (S. C. de Prop. Fid. 22 Jan. 1759.) A similar reply was given to the Bishop of Natchez in 1877, who asked whether priests to whom the Faculty had been communicated could select the days for the Indulgence in their parishes or missions. In this case the mention of a visit to the church was expressly made as a condition of gaining the Indulgence.<sup>1</sup>

There are two important conclusions to be drawn from these answers of the H. Office; first, that a visit to the Church designated is required for gaining the Indulgence. This is the import of the words addressed to Mgr. Elder, viz: *colla visita di una delle quali*, etc.—Secondly, that the Faculty of granting this triple Indulgence can be exercised only once for each church, mission or locality.

<sup>1</sup> Circa l'Indulgenza che può il vescovo concedere tre volte l'anno in forza di speciale indulto la Santità Sua col voto di questa S. C. ha risoluto che per la consecuzione di essa può il vescovo *assegnare diverse chiese, colla visita di una delle quali* posse il popolo conseguire l'Indulgenza, e che questa in diverse città e luoghi può in diversi tempi assegnarla, e pubblicarla, *come pure l'Indulgenza delle 40 ore* purché nella medesima città e luogo siano solo tre volte l'anno pubblicate. (S. C. del S. Ufficio 16 Gennaio, 1728.)

But what if the Bisop grants the Faculty to every approved priest in his diocese, including the assistants at large churches, and also such of the clergy who do no missionary service, such as professors in our seminaries, chaplains to religious communities, etc.? In answer we point to the fact that the Indulgence is not a personal favor, but one to be used for the benefit of the faithful and therefore really given to the latter. The Bishop is the directly commissioned dispenser of the privilege, and he can delegate it to his clergy. This fact, however, does not authorize him to enlarge upon the original extent of the concession. Where the Indulgence has been duly published it cannot be repeated, and therefore the Bishop's own Faculty ceases. Practically, therefore, the pastor of a church or mission is the only one to whom it can be communicated, unless for the benefit of persons who are out of the reach of parochial ministrations. Hence the superior of a seminary or college, the chaplain of an institute or hospital, etc. might use the Faculty in favor of those, many or few, under his charge who cannot otherwise avail themselves of the privilege accorded to a neighboring mission or parish district.

In some instances the S. Congregation has indeed sanctioned the use of this Faculty in a distributive sense, that is to say, a priest or missionary may impart the Indulgence to any number of people in the same locality as often as is necessary to allow all the faithful to gain it. But this interpretation is one of special concession obtained by the missionaries of countries like Cochinchina where the constant danger of persecution from the pagan natives and the precarious condition of the converts forbids anything like organized meetings of all the faithful in a district, so that the reception of the sacraments at any given time for all is an impossibility whereby they would be totally deprived of the benefits implied in the concession of the Faculty.<sup>1</sup>

The sick may, under the general provisions granted in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Decr. S. C. de Propag. Fid. 12 Maii, 1850, ad Vicar. Apost. Concinc. et Mandchur.—*Collect.* n. 1019.



their favor for all Indulgences of this kind, obtain the same if the confessor or pastor commute the required conditions, except that of the worthy reception of the Sacrament of Penance.

As no mention is made of the extension "pro Defunctis," we must conclude with the learned commentator on our *Facultates Apostolicæ*, "Indulgentia hæc defunctis applicari nequit."<sup>1</sup>

THE EDITOR.

---

### JANSENISM AND SECULARISM.

A FOREIGN periodical has recently published an account of the "Jansenists and their Schools." The matter is so instructive and the tone so congenial to the educational thought on this side of the ocean, that the article has been thought worthy of reproduction in a pedagogical publication of this country.<sup>2</sup> There are many features about the teaching of the Jansenists which the writer finds worthy of praise. There are other points about which he does not profess to know much, but which he considers must have been present in some laudable degree, even though appearances would show their existence improbable. A few characteristics are decidedly Jansenistic, and these are highly lauded. And whatever the writer imagines should be distinctly Catholic or rather Jesuit, in the art of education, is introduced at convenient periods, by way of reflection and contrast, to set off the superior wisdom of the Jansenists.

It so happens that the praiseworthy points are distinctively Catholic, though the writer does not know that. Thus the

<sup>1</sup> *Commentarium in Facultates Apostolicas, ad usum venerabilis Cleri Americani.* Edit. III recognita et aucta, curante Joseph Putzer, C. SS. R. —Ilchestriae, 1893.

<sup>2</sup> The *Educational Review*, December, 1893, January, 1894; Education in foreign periodicals: "The Jansenists and their Schools," by H. Courthope Bowen, of Cambridge, England, in the *Maria Grey College Magazine*.

“watchfulness, patience, gentleness,” exhibited in the “little schools” of the Jansenists, came from the practice of the same schools whence the teachers came, who were a product of Catholic education, who lived in a thoroughly Catholic atmosphere, and who, though rapidly becoming heretics, did not all at once cease to be Catholic in their ways. The advice of the arch-Jansenist, St. Cyran: “Speak little, bear with much and pray still more,” appears quite novel to the non-Catholic mind, yet it is quite normal in all Catholic systems of teaching and conduct. The writer states that “the masters never went to their classes without first praying God in private that He would bless their work. Men,” he goes on to say, “who taught in this spirit, who set so high a value on love, and who strove in every way to develop the judgment and reason, were not likely, I think, to go far wrong.” No; that is the reason why Catholic teaching seldom goes far wrong, until a teacher thinks it advisable to pray God “in private” only. He who does only this will soon fail to do even so much.

Not everything, however, which still clung to the Jansenists from the days of their Catholic life meets with unqualified approbation. Thus the personal reserve with which a Catholic teacher, and still more a religious consecrated to God, guards against undue liberties, however slight, is made a subject of ridicule; it is pronounced “laughable, and partly vulgar in its suggestiveness.” That is strikingly true to the Protestant mind, which considers it not respectable for an elegant person to think sin at all possible, or vice within any measurable distance. The graceful form, the suave manner, the polite address—what have they to do with the sinfulness of the vulgar Adam?

But it is the out-and-out Jansenistic traits that appeal directly to the Protestant’s religious tastes. “It is very noticeable,” says the critic, “that, though religious services abounded at Port-Royal, the children, both boys and girls, were never forced to attend. They were even begged not to go to the services unless they felt a real inclination to do so. Above all things, hypocrisy was to be avoided.” Exactly;

hypocrites are ever so sensitive on the subject of hypocrisy. He continues: "And further we find Sainte-Euphemie (Jacqueline Pascal) stating that 'the little sisters make their own prayers, according to their devotion and as God inspires . . . we do not burden them with a great number of oral and mental petitions.'" These poor little girls must have been advanced contemplatives. The Our Father, the Hail Mary or the Beads, would have been too common for this religion—vulgar perhaps in the suggestiveness that their souls were not aristocratic enough in the kingdom of God. The same hypocritical pride and conceit revealed itself in the infinite care with which all signs of approbation were to be withheld from the children; all rewards, all incentives to emulation, lest their hearts should be touched by vanity or self-conceit.

Started as an educational system at Port-Royal des Champs, near Versailles, in 1643, the Jansenistic method operated, in the course of its protracted existence, upon the very extraordinary number of not more than fifty children, boys and girls all told. This extraordinary number of not over fifty, according to the testimony of Sainte-Beuve, was distributed in four or five establishments of which Port-Royal was only one. The classes of boys contained only five or six pupils each; those of the girls still less. And the protracted existence, to which we have alluded, extended over the very considerable period of "less than seventeen years." In 1660 they passed out of existence. It were worthy of a philosopher's mind to discover the secret by which an insignificant, wriggling parasite, that objected vehemently to going out of existence, could manage to get mounted in the museum of history with greater splendor and in a more prominent place than the whole body of the Catholic Church, with all the limbs and members of her religious teaching orders taken together. Perhaps because it is dead. That would give it a place, but not such a place in modern encyclopedism, which tabulates every single unit, though it be only a dead microbe of a system. But then Jansenism is not dead; it lives in a prolific posterity. And this is precisely the reason why it is so

splendidly mounted. As the Romans of old did with the statues of their fathers in every funeral procession, when they marched out from under the hills of eternal Rome, and vaunted the glories of the multiple generations already buried while they interred the latest, the melancholy train of free-thinkers and innovators, of sceptics and revolutionists, wind round under the shadow of the Catholic Church and her institutions, and they bury and are buried, and there is no end to their dead idols or their processions.

In this respect, the graces of Jansenism coincide very much with those of J. J. Rousseau. This philosopher had never been at school himself, and had never had a child to send to school. Hence, neither as son nor as father, did he know anything of education. Yet he has become the legislator by excellence for all schools; and the revolutionists of the Convention decreed the honors of the Pantheon to his ashes, because he was the legislator of "the only code of education sanctioned by nature." It was very much the same with Port-Royal.

Having no other consistency than that of a theological club, or a vestry of souls altogether *élite*, Port-Royal was always and essentially a centre of opposition—its doctors and its nuns alike. It meant opposition to the Pope in point of religious subordination and doctrine; opposition to the whole hierarchy of France; opposition to the Government. It was a focus of resistance and "independence"; and it has been canonized by all free-thinkers and secularists ever since, who forgive the Jansenists the Catholicity which clung to them personally, in view of the sublimer gifts of independence and rebelliousness, which have since been wonderfully perfected by evolution. This theological vestry cultivated a breed of notions, which like a plague of insects, it sent over a Christian nation to fly chiefly by night; or, if any flew by day, they were to do so in profound secrecy, and were to be made known as profound secrets. "I have lent to our poor children of Sainte-Marie," writes the Jansenistic lady, Mme. de Sévigné, "a book with which they are charmed; it is *La Frequente* (the book on *Frequent Communion* by the Jan-

senist, Arnaud) ; but it is the greatest secret in the world ! ” Abounding in the gift of mutual admiration, they cried : A miracle ! at every production of the two gifted men, belonging to the sect, Pascal and Nicole, and at any production of the rest of the common herd ; eyes and ears, particularly those of women, were at once directed to the meteoric splendor of the new lucubration, especially as it was all secret, and the meteor was to be seen only by peeping at it in the dark ; and the women went into ecstasies. Though condemned officially by the Church in France, it attracted the sympathies of all the parliaments in France and, for that matter, of all the ecclesiastical Gallicanism of France, that is to say, of nationalism which, whether parliamentary or clerical, is ever anti-Roman, anti-Papal. In its infinite piety and profound reverence for the sacraments, it objected to their being profaned, and it manoeuvred to have them neglected ; and so it fell in line with all libertinism. Devoted to innovations in every line, it contended at every point with the Jesuit methods of education, and so won a special party of adherents, whom a common hatred bound together, if not any mutual love. Standing in need of the crowd as well as of the women, it brought theology and the most abstruse questions of controversy out into the arena of every day literature, as in our days men use the vicious press for the same purpose. Original in nothing, except its solidarity and secret methods of practising insubordination, it poured out from the press new works in French prose, from the common Latin treasury of Catholic literature ; and translating the thoughts of other men, without acknowledging the source, it was thought phenomenally erudite. In particular, with regard to French style, De Maistre remarks,<sup>1</sup> that the Jansenistic school wrote in the infancy of French prose, and thus found it quite easy to get among the first in merit, when they were among the first in date.

Puritanism under Cromwell begat licentiousness under Charles II. The same occurred in France, with the puritan-

ism of the Jansenists. But it was in a more organized fashion, with more of a constitutional disease reaching to the very heart of the nation, and preparing a more terrific result in that general subversion of society which was to ensue. We have not space to follow out the process by which a new educational policy, that of mathematics and encyclopedism, supplanted classical and ecclesiastical studies; the process by which the *philosophes* of the eighteenth century, taking only a classical style and pagan notions out of their classic authors, undermined therewith the entire method of right teaching and of a solid formation of the mind. The fact is that, as the eighteenth century ran its course, speculative philosophers of the pagan type added their strength to Gallicans, and to Jansenists, to parliaments and to revolutionists, and would have everything reconstructed anew.

It is sad to reflect that the secluded religious life itself did not escape the virus of Jansenism; and only three orders are noted as having escaped the action of the inevitable law of decline.<sup>1</sup> And decline meant the loss of influence on the passing generations. The ascendancy of the ninety Jesuit colleges was bitterly resented, until they were swept away. A multitude of private schools, now called "academies" for the first time, were conducted by private irresponsible individuals, who offered as a programme of studies a system completely inverting all traditions of Catholic teachers. Physical culture and the social accomplishments held the first place in the programme; there was riding, fencing, dancing, polite manners, with mathematics, history and geography. Every light accomplishment and pedagogical dissipation took the place of strict discipline, of order and the practice of thoroughness in mental formation. The young exquisites who were brought up in these private domiciles did what they liked under the immediate care of governors, whose authority was little and morality dubious. In short, they received neither the solid education heretofore professed in the religious houses, nor that masculine temper

<sup>1</sup> Montalembert, Introduction to "Monks of the West," ch. vii, Decline.

which was imparted by the public education of the universities, conducted then, as always hitherto, under ecclesiastical supervision. It was clear that a generation was growing up in whose culture a revolution would find apt material to assimilate, and in whose mental and moral helplessness the reign of anarchy would run through a splendid cycle of existence.

The chemist Chaptal, in his report to the First Consul Napoleon on the condition of public education, stated that among the causes of irreligion was the "philosophical spirit, foreign to the colleges, which had developed itself boldly in the numerous private schools, in the academies, in the reunions of free thinkers, who propagated, in spite of the Government and priests, the terrible principles whence issued atheism and anarchy." Now atheism alone, as De Maistre remarks, is a very inert principle; "it rots in silence and scarcely attacks authority; but . . . being united in our age with a principle eminently active, the revolutionary spirit, this formidable amalgamation has lent it an air of activity." Atheism and revolutionary agitation combining together explode in the most terrific form of that fanaticism, which Donoso Cortes characterizes well when he says: "Fanaticism always advances by the suppression of all opposing forces; philosophical fanaticism suppresses ideas; historical fanaticism suppresses facts; political fanaticism suppresses men."

## II.

Educational fanaticism suppresses the rising generation. It does so under the pretext of enlightenment and liberty. Whether disapproving or not the policy of a blood-red revolution, it carries into effect identical principles. "It is necessary to form free men for the Republic, above all, men who are friends of equality; it is necessary to protect young minds from the impure breath of prejudices . . . Now the youth of France will not be completely broken to the yoke of equality (*façonnée au joug de l'égalité*), except in a system of education uniform and common." So spoke one

of the orators under the Directory; and he developed his plan of compulsory education (*d'édication forcée*.)<sup>1</sup> Compare with this an episode just enacted among ourselves, quite typical of the general trend in thought and policy. A pedagogical authority claimed for Massachusetts the glory of promoting educational activity on this side of the ocean, and showed that his State had evolved American education in *six degrees of compulsion*. A distinguished authority of the State of New York disputed the claim, and a lively duel ensued. But, far from either pedagogue adverting to the absurdity of making enlightenment and liberty rest upon *compulsion*, Mr. Draper argued for New York on the ground that its compulsion had always been more drastic and complete, than Mr. Martin had proved for Massachusetts. Suffice it to quote the words in which the offense had been given, and which were taken up in the bill of indictment of New York *vs.* the arrogance of Massachusetts: "Reviewing the evolutionary process from the beginning," Mr. Martin had said, "we note that there have been six steps: compulsory education, compulsory schools, compulsory certification of teachers, compulsory supervision, compulsory taxation, compulsory attendance; and it seems that Massachusetts took each of these steps in advance of the other States—a little in advance of her sister States in New England, and far in advance of all the others."<sup>2</sup>

We have advanced far beyond the revolution. The spirit of those times, in education at least, was altogether tame compared with the spirit dominant in our days. "Fanaticism suppresses ideas; suppresses facts; suppresses men." The tyrants of the Convention and of the Directory could with only the utmost difficulty bring themselves, and still more a Christian people, to adopt but a small portion of an educational system, which, in the course of a century's incubation of revolutionary ideas has become so natural that we scarcely notice its complete disagreement with the primary

<sup>1</sup> Duplantier: Cf. *De L'Université Nouvelle, Fille Aînée de Révolution*, p. 37; *Documents concernant la Compagnie de Jésus*, t. iii.

<sup>2</sup> *Educational Review*, April 1892, p. 313; *Public School Pioneering in the United States*.



ideas of Christian enlightenment and liberty. We are in the age of secularism, mature, settled and systematic.

Let us sketch briefly the features of this educational organism in embryo. The likeness is quite striking between its embryonic promise and its fulfilment in maturity. The main lines are : a department of public instruction, compulsion, official normal schools to turn out the true breed of teachers, centralization, monopoly ; and, as somehow Catholic schools have never been successfully suppressed, the reduction of Catholic education to the level of a repeating agency—repeating methods, plans, programmes, examinations, terminology, and if possible, repeating the immorality too ; though the results on this last score have never satisfied expectations.

In 1791, the notorious ex-Bishop of Autun, Talleyrand-Perigord, made a report to the Constituent Assembly. He spoke in the name of the Committee of the Constitution. He said : “The public powers are organized : liberty, equality exist in the safe keeping of the law, property has fallen back on its proper basis ; and yet the Constitution might seem incomplete if there were not attached to it as a conservative and vivifying part, *public instruction*. Lo, a momentous word ! which is to resound with thrilling reverberations, in bureaux, ministries, departments, all through the coming nineteenth century. The speaker proceeded to cast a glance, rapid and terrified, at the “ nullity or the innumerable vices of what hitherto had been called instruction ; at those blind and barbarous prejudices which, ever throwing us back to that epoch when all knowledge was concentrated in the cloisters, would seem still, after more than ten centuries, to destine the universality of citizens to dwell in monasteries.” He would have the constitution and the declaration of rights be the basis of all instruction. Still, as the last proposal in a long programme he laid down the principle of freedom of education, that is to say, of liberty for persons to teach, and of scholars to be taught, as people think fit.

The National Assembly in 1792 listened to the philosopher Condorcet. Everything was to be new in the project which

he brought forward. Physical science was the one element indispensable, even in primary schools; "were it only to save the population from sorcerers and the inventors or narrators of miracles." He would have a representative form of government established in the schools of children. He admitted the necessary independence of all educational establishments; nevertheless it was necessary that primary grades should be entirely in the hands of the public authority. This was astute enough. For, if children are once corrupt, they can safely be allowed to go anywhere afterwards; and not even corrupt teachers are necessary adjuncts in the vocation which is common to both.

But all this was going ahead too rapidly. Nothing whatever came of these dreams.

The Convention followed, and the reign of terror. Petit cried that schools of republicanism must be set up for the fathers, before we think of the children; since republicanism must begin in the embryo of the species. Ducos called out for an education which should be common to all and forced upon all, that is, the education of liberty; for, said he: "We have to choose between home education and liberty. . . . As long as a common system of education has not brought rich and poor together, it is vain for the laws to proclaim holy equality." But all the oratory came to nothing. The new Constitution of 1793 guaranteed perfect liberty "to open courses and private schools in all parts of public instruction, and to manage them as people thought fit." However, soon Robespierre and some others sounded again the note of common and compulsory education. This was in the glorious Year I, of the Republic.

In the year II, as it was clear that liberty of education was a menace to all liberties, Danton contended, with all the force of his logic and his lungs, that it was time to recognize the great principle "that children belong to the Republic before belonging to their parents. . . . We ought to say to parents: We have done enough for your affections; we do not snatch your children from you, but you cannot withdraw them from the *national influence*."

There was no end to reports and orations on the part of the Committee of Public Instruction ; and no end to the advances, retreats, the aspirations and defeats of the embarrassed chamber of homicides, who, though they could guillotine the parents wholesale, could not manage to get at the children. In the Year III it was determined to abandon the fathers and mothers as incorrigible ; "brought up well or ill," it was sagely decided to leave them as they were. But, as a middle term of compromise for getting at the young generation, without whom the Revolution would be put back half a century, a proposal of Lakanal was gratefully accepted. It was to get up the right breed of teachers. Such was the origin of the official *normal schools*. The first essay in the line of this brilliant idea was not so happy. Fourteen hundred citizens, already properly tempered and of tried patriotism attended the new institution ; but, after three months, they clamored for their passports and the payment of their traveling expenses home.

The official *Moniteur* declaimed : "Every one shall be republican in our Republic. We will punish the traitors who profess their hatred ; and we will demand that every one profess love. Teachers, you shall make it germinate, or we will snatch from you the sacred deposit of the children of the country." It was decreed that no one should teach unless married or a widower. This was to exclude priests and religious. In particular, woman teachers were to be won over to the republican doctrines ; since the Republic could never stand, if the mind and hearts of French women were not conquered. "Cry, if you will, Oppression ! Inquisition ! What matters it, since these are but the cries of the enemies of our political regeneration !"

However, years pass by. The twelfth year of the new era has come. The atheistic schools are vacant ; no teachers are available ; the Catholic schools, suppressed in one quarter spring up in another, and are thronged. With the utmost industry in applying circuitous methods, urging tortuous arguments, constantly repeating the same debates, and proposing new schemes, the idea of compulsory and of common

education is still being hammered into the heads of the legislative body by the more progressive members. And, at length, a great figure appears on the scene, that of one who, himself a child of the Revolution, brings a genius and power of his own to accomplish the work of the Revolution. Napoleon Bonaparte will do with his educational code what he effects with his code of civil law—set up in practical working order an ideal rule or law, which other nations will embody in their life or will copy, even though, like the Jansenists, they do not acknowledge the source, or like the eulogists of the Jansenists they know nothing about the source. First, he centralizes and monopolizes all education in his Imperial University. Then, as even he does not succeed well, for the private and ecclesiastical schools in which the Catholic laity and the clergy are brought up will not be put down, he tolerates them; but he makes them mere annexes of his own system, and so corrupts them.

The Imperial University was an institution without example so far in the history of the world. But all Bureaus, Ministries, Departments, Boards of Education or Public Instruction in the present century, represent with more or less efficiency its essential idea. The first article of its Constitution, as presented to the Legislative Body of the Empire by Fourcroy in 1806, reads thus:

“Article I. There shall be formed, under the name of Imperial University, a body charged exclusively with the public instruction and education of all the Empire.”

In his explanation of the project, the orator explained that the purpose “was to consolidate the new institutions, to bind their different parts together; which necessitated the formation of a teaching body for all the Empire; and a single head should have the entire superintendence and direction.”

Then, in 1808, followed an imperial decree establishing the Monopoly, as complete as that of salt in Italy or Bengal; and it contained the following articles, disfranchising private or ecclesiastical schools:

“No school, no establishment of instruction, whatsoever it be, can be formed outside of the Imperial University, and without the authorization of its chief.

“No one can open a school, or teach publicly, without being a member of the University, and a graduate of one of its faculties.”

There were no half measures here. In the Convention and National Assembly, in the Legislative Body under the Directory, there had been question only of a national conscription of the children: “You do not hesitate,” pleaded one of the orators with them, “to levy the youth of the country and send them forth in arms for its defence; then why do you hesitate to levy the children of the country into the schools. There is a greater cause at stake here!” And so they had played with projects of elementary books, and catechisms on the rights of man and the constitution, and what not! But now it is a great imperial fact, a drag-net thrown round the whole nation, from which escape who can!

The *fonctionnaires*, or public employees, were the first to report. They filled the new *Lycées*, and occupied all the free burses with their children. They were the first, and they were practically the last. So villainous and notorious was the corruption of the youth in the imperial schools, with new developments of student life not heard of before, secret societies, suicides, and forms of crime, of which a grave author says, that the like had not been known even in pagan antiquity, that the private schools and those under ecclesiastical management, grew, multiplied, flourished. Bonaparte had established the monopoly, but it had failed; for he had been trying at the same time to act the part of a Catholic sovereign, restoring religion and the Church in France. Now he threw off the mask, as he had reason to do, for he had the Sovereign Pontiff in prison.

An imperial decree of 1811 wiped out the line of demarcation which separated private from public schools, levied a tax in the shape of children on the private schools to fill the ranks of the others, and settled by a stroke of violence what was impossible through any other means: “The chiefs and faculty cannot keep any boarders in their houses above the age of nine years, as long as the number of boarders

required by the *Lycée* or College established in the same city, or place of residence, is not yet complete. The chiefs and faculty shall be considered only as repeating the instruction of the *Lycées* (*comme des répétiteurs de l'enseignement des Lycées*), to which they will be required to send the boarders who remain with them. These boarders shall wear the military uniform of the *Lycees*." Thus one hundred municipal centres were reduced to subjugation by the despot. Other institutions, beyond the reach of these centres, were reduced in another way; they were forbidden to teach at all above a certain low grade. Similar measures, and even more severe, were taken with ecclesiastical seminaries.

It was high time for the tyrant to be overthrown and sent to Elba. But the system was not overthrown. The few stray lines we have drawn of the first scene in a most interesting modern drama show the unmistakable characteristics of a policy, to which in our day we have grown habituated and callous. The spirit which engendered these developments, and the developments themselves carried on to a much higher degree of perfection, have become the history of an entire century. The decadence of the religious sentiment has facilitated the increase of new kinds of educational tyranny, whether exercised by the dominant will of imperialism, or the equally dominant will of an intangible multitude. Compulsion and secularism, centralization and monopoly, have mingled as native ideas with the free, liberal and progressive thought at the close of the nineteenth century. And perhaps one of the most distressing circumstances that we have to note is the apparent helplessness, with which our Catholic schools in divers countries, whether under compulsion or not, have come to *repeat*, like mere echoes, the systems and methods and programmes of an irreligious and false pedagogy, "national" or only amateur, as if we had anything to learn from it, or had learnt nothing from our own ancestry.

THOS. HUGHES, S.J.

*St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.*

THE EVOLUTION THEORY APPLIED TO MAN, IN THE LIGHT OF  
THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

WHETHER or not we accept the nebular hypothesis of Laplace or the meteorological hypothesis advanced by Thompson and Helmholtz as a sufficient explanation of the phenomena which constitute our present solar system, together with the many varieties of organic growth on our planet, one thing remains unquestioned by the religious mind, and that is, the origin of all created things from a divine source. It is revealed, defined truth that the one true God is Creator and Lord of all things visible and invisible.<sup>1</sup>

The Church is hardly likely ever to define a dogma which has for its object that individuals or species of the vegetable and animal kingdoms derive their origin from a few primitive types or even from but one original cell. Such a definition, if nevertheless given, could have merely the purpose of guarding the faithful against the deductions of those who claim that the evolution theory leads to the legitimate conclusion of a denial of God as the creator of the Universe and of man's origin as described in the sacred narrative.<sup>2</sup> The Church does not often challenge views which are apt to perplex the simple faithful inasmuch as they seem to be in opposition to views long cherished by the philosophy of her schools.

If "the doctrine of evolution has come to be an acceptable and accepted doctrine to the general bulk of men of science in either hemisphere," because "all the various indications of affinity . . . thereby simultaneously acquire one natural and satisfactory explanation."<sup>3</sup> then let the scientist, opposed to evolution, show that such an explanation is com-

1 Acta et Decr. Conc. Vatic. Sess. III, c. 1.

2 St. Thomas distinguishes between that which *per se* belongs to the substance of faith *v. g.* "the world had a beginning," or "all was created by God;" and that which *per accidens* belongs to faith *v. g.* as to the manner, or order in which creation proceeded. II Sent. dist. ar. 2. Thus it seems to belong to faith *per se* that man is the result of an immediate creative act of God; *per accidens* that man was created on the sixth day.

3 "Evolution and Christianity," by St. George Mivart, *Cosmopolitan*, June, 1892, p. 151.

patible with "distinct centres" of vegetable and animal life; let him maintain his views by the law of constancy and continuity in spite of the variety and variability of species, which will be so convincing an argument in his favor as it is supposed to be in favor those who use it against the possibility of miracles; let him demonstrate if "everything happens from within excluding all intervention from without,"<sup>1</sup> the utter uselessness and ineffectiveness of affinity and environment.

The theologian, however, while he accepts the ascertained results of natural science, will first of all be guided in his inquiry by dogmatic principles. And according to those principles there is no doubt that "God created man to His own image and likeness, to the image of God He created him, male and female He created them."<sup>2</sup> Evolution of man from a protoplasm, a common germ of all organic life, he will consequently reject, even though the evolutionist admit that the seven or eight<sup>3</sup> primitive types, or the single, powerful cell were created by God. This latter must be emphasized all the more since materialists consider the theory of protoplasm evident from the study of organisms, and the strongest argument which can be urged against the origin of man by a distinct creative act.<sup>4</sup> They can afford to admit creation of "Ur-stoff," and still maintain their thesis.<sup>5</sup>

1 Rénan's "Marc Aurel," p. 637. This same author in his "Examen de Conscience" asserts: "On peut poser en thèse que *le fieri* par développement interne sans intervention extérieure est la loi de tout l'univers que nous perçons."

2 Gen. c. 1, v. 27.

3 The celebrated Cuvier reduced all species of animals to four primitive types. See Prisco's "*Il Darwinismo esposto e disanimato* in the *Accademia di San Tommaso*, vol. ix, p. 227 ss.

4 See Haeckel's *Histoire de la creation des êtres organisées d'après les lois naturelles*. 2d ed. 1877, p. 307. He enumerates twenty-two different stages in the development of man from inferior grades.

5 Lange, in his history of materialism, vol 2, p. 249, writes as follows: "Thinkers have long since occupied themselves rather with the origin of organisms than with the origin of the universe. This question is interesting to them (materialists), because it offers an easy transition into anthropology, which is the main ground for materialistic polemics."



It may seem somewhat remarkable that there should be no conciliar definition, no canon directly condemning the doctrine of evolution of man, or explicitly anathematizing the teaching of the Darwinists.<sup>1</sup> But it is not on that account difficult to prove that the creation of man by God is a revealed truth, that, consequently, evolution of man is contrary to faith, even if there were no other theological criteria than those contained in the ancient dogmas of original sin, of unity of the human soul, and in other doctrinal definitions bearing more remotely on man's origin. There are, however, relevant criteria nearer at hand, some of which I propose to consider in the present article.

No one will expect to find an explicit mention of the modern theory of evolution in dogmatic enactments prior to the actual invention of that theory. Moreover, since the theory is made to serve all purposes of anti-Christian polemics at the present time, it cannot be expected that any attempted refutation of it will meet all its possible applications. My intention is, therefore, simply to show from dogmatic criteria that man's origin is due to a distinct creative act on the part of God. For a summary of those criteria I have consulted the authentic acts of the Council of the Vatican published by the Jesuit Fathers under the title of *Collectio Lacensis*.<sup>2</sup> Those acts are all the more important because the Syllabus of Pius IX., which is a resumé of the principal doctrinal errors of modern times, served as a basis for the dogmatic subjects to be considered in the Council.

Distinct mention of the theory of evolution is made two or three times in the several chapters, canons, and discussions referring to the subject; and we shall see why a doctrine so loudly proclaimed and hailed as the grandest

1 It is admitted that Mr. Darwin "brings within the scope of his theory the mind of man with all his intellectual powers." "Evolution in Christianity" by Mivart, *Cosmopolitan* July 1891, p. 333; and Sept. p. 614.

2 Full title: "Acta et Decreta Sacror. Conciliorum Recentiorum. Collectio Lacensis"—tom. vii. For a key to this volume see "Constitutiones Dogmaticae" etc. a Theod. Granderath, S.J.

achievement of modern investigation, has not been treated more prominently by the Fathers of the Council.

In the first place let me say a few words regarding the treatment of our subject in the Vatican Council; next I shall explain the particular data of the Council referring to the evolution of man.

Those acquainted with the history of the late ecumenical Council know that the first draft containing certain errors to be censured and certain truths to be defined was made with special reference to the Syllabus of Pope Pius IX. The first draft was, however, afterwards completely changed both as to form and style, preserving only its substance.<sup>1</sup> The entire subject-matter was comprised under two general heads: "Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticae de Fide," and "Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticae de Ecclesia." The first, Schema Const. Dog. de Fide, was finally subdivided into two parts: "Schema Constitutionis Dogm. de Fide Catholica," and "Schema Constitutionis Dogm. de praecipuis mysteriis Fidei." Only the first part, consisting of four chapters with their respective canons, was solemnly defined and promulgated with the Constitutio dogm. prima de Ecclesia. In the discussions on the first chapter of this part we find merely some general references to our subject; but in the discussions on the second chapter<sup>2</sup> in the second part of the Schema Constitut. Dogm. de Fide, which treats of the origin of man and of human nature, the present question is touched upon more directly, although even here the theory of the evolution of man is only vaguely mentioned. The words of that chapter are substantially the words of Holy Writ, except in that portion of it which inculcates anew the definition of the Council of Vienne and which emphasizes in particular the teaching of Pius IX.<sup>3</sup>

1 Reasons are given in the "Relatio" of R. P. D. Ludo. Piè, episc. Pictaviens. Collect. Lac. C. v. p. 210, b.ss., and "Constitut. Dog." by Theod. Granderath, p. 77; also in "Arbeiten des Vatic. Concils," by Dr. Conrad Martin, p. 12, ss.

2 This chapter is the sixteenth of the entire Schema Const. Dog. de Fide.

3 See "Adnot. etc.," C. v. p. 545 a. The doctrine of the human soul is there defined.

This apparent neglect to stigmatize in express terms the Darwinistic theory of the evolution of man seems to me to corroborate my views of the position of the Church assuming that man's creation by God directly is of faith, and admits of no doubt to the contrary. Indeed, "there is no reason why a truth so unmistakably pronounced in Sacred Scriptures, denied by no one, should be defined."<sup>1</sup> was a proposition made in the sixteenth session of the *deputati* on matters of faith, when the advisability of a definition of our present question was considered. The particular data of the Council bearing on our subject are more definite. The radical supposition when considering them is always the fact that the theory of evolution of man is "part and parcel of the general process of evolution," and rather a result of investigation carried on under the guidance of a system of philosophy, destructive of Christianity's fundamental doctrine of God; for it is not a deduction of purely scientific and impartial research. But the general system of evolution was, with others equally dangerous, condemned in the very first chapter of the *Constitutio Dogm. de Fide*. Thus the ax had been laid to the root and the question of the evolution of man as part of the entire theory was settled.

Whatever truth there may be in evolution, justly restricted and judiciously applied, there is no doubt that the abettors of modern evolution imagined they had finally struck clear evidence against the creation of man by God, and in order to supply what they considered a defect, they undertook to re-write a genesis of man. Insisting on their mechanico-physical theory of matter and force, they gave an account of man's origin, not hiding their intention to neutralize the idea of a Creator.<sup>2</sup> The Council, in condemning materialism as a destructive system of philosophy, branded as contrary to the tenets of Catholic faith all its ramifications. It was unnecessary and hardly within the dignified scope of an Œcu-

1 See C. v. p. 1610, b.

2 See Dr. Eugen Muller's "Natur und Wunder," p. 12, ss, and 16, ss.

menical Council<sup>1</sup> to take cognizance of the various false systems in detail, or to legislate against their different consequences. Whilst, therefore, not all errors that could be deduced from a false system of reasoning were condemned in name, they were all condemned in fact. It was sufficient to destroy their roots, and to stigmatize in particular such as could delude simple minds, or such as were calculated to draw teachers of Christian doctrine from the ways of truth. In some cases it might be a question of prudence whether or not the prescription of a particular theory would likely produce salutary effects either among Catholics or even among those not directly under obedience to the Church.<sup>2</sup>

I venture to say that this seeming neglect of this particular phase of materialism is a mark of foresight and good judgment. The evolution of man which was hailed with such delight at the time of its promulgation, has since by reason of a sober investigation and unprejudiced study gradually dropped in the general estimation.<sup>3</sup> It is to be regretted however, that the bad seed once sown is apt to continue in its growth and that many of the modern sciolists continue to cultivate the noxious weed which, like a parasite, entangles the human mind.

How much the Vatican Council might have eventually defined in the matter, if other more urgent questions had not demanded its more immediate attention, and if a period of

1 See "Adnot. in C. I—C. v. p. 519, c: "Unde generatim solummodo designatur materialismus tanquam negatio omnis realitatis praeter materiam, et transformationes aut explicationes materiales, in quibus utique est negatio existentiae Dei, et spiritualis atque immortalis animae comprehenditur, etc."

2 "Relatio in Canon. C. I—C. v. p. 113, b, c., and "Emendatio C. iv—" p. 163, a.; reasons why anathemas were affixed see in "Constit. Dogm." by Granderath p. 15, and 16, note.

3 See Dr. Eugen Muller's "Natur und Wunder" p. 35, ss. Dr. Mivart in his article in the *Nineteenth Century* for Sept. 1893, thinks "that philosophy on the part of the second Romanes lecturer justifies the hope that the process of mental evolution has in him (Huxley) had this result, if those words of his cited signify an acceptance of the distinction between what is 'formal' and what only 'material' in the sphere of ethics on the one hand, and an appreciation of the essentially distinct nature of man on the other."

storm and stress had not compelled its premature prorogation, can be easily surmised from the wording of the second chapter of the Schema Dogmaticae Constitutionis de praecipuis mysteriis fidei, and from the amendments and discussions of that chapter.<sup>1</sup> The whole doctrine of that chapter was so clearly of faith that no doubt occurred of its permitting any exception. Evolution of man from inferior organisms was too absurd in the light of the explicit declaration of the Sacred Scripture, that no distinction or any, however labored, interpretation of its text could make it plausible. And throughout the long chain of Christian tradition not a link could be found to connect a theory which in its very supposition runs counter to all Christian sense. Natural science even, and universal persuasion, unbiased, true to their office, save the human race from such disgrace.<sup>2</sup> The Church could leave the decision to such tribunals whilst she occupied herself with questions more essential and less evident to unbiased common sense. An infallible definition is not required except to inculcate in a solemn and explicit manner what is a proper subject of Christian doctrine, such knowledge as "preserved him who was first formed by God, the father of the world, when he was created alone."<sup>3</sup>

In the first amended draft the words referring to our subject are plain: "For of the nature of man whom the Lord God formed of the slime of the earth and breathed into his face the breath of life, and man was made in a living soul, we teach and declare that he is one, consisting of soul (rationali anima) and body."<sup>4</sup> In the Schema Constitutionis Dogm. de praecipuis mysteriis Fidei this doctrine was substantially repeated, only somewhat more directly stated: "Of man's

1 See Litter. Apost. Pie IX C. v. p. 497 ss. It is a calumny to assert that the only motive of the Pope in urging the Council was to define papal infallibility. Granderath, "Const. Dog." p. 104, and C. v. p. 1018, c.

2 "Tu," Cicero writes to Brutus, "quum tibi sive deus sive mater, ut ita dicam, verum omnium natura dederit animum, quo nihil est praestantius neque divinius, sic te ipsum abicies atque prosternes, ut nihil inter te atque quadrupedem aliquam putes interesse?"—Paradox, I, 14.

3 Wisdom C. x., v. 1.

4 C. v. p. 516, and p. 507, c.

nature and origin, however, taught by Sacred Scriptures, the holy Roman Church holds and teaches the following: Heaven and earth and all their adornments being finished, God created man to His image and likeness, that he might rule the whole earth. Into the body therefore, formed of the slime of the earth He infused a soul, called forth from nothing, a soul immaterial, incorruptible, immortal, endowed with intelligence and free-will, etc.<sup>1</sup>

Two doctrinal points we find here to be emphasized; the first regarding man's nature, the second regarding the origin of the human race from one parent. The existence of man was accounted for by a special creative act not only as to the whole man, but with particular reference to man's body, his soul, and their union. God is the efficient cause and exemplar of man. Evolution has no part whatever in the formation of man's parts. The body is not shaped by an intermediate process of transformation, but by an immediate act of God "of the slime of the earth." "Only this I have found," says Ecclesiastes, "that God made man right."<sup>2</sup> "God created man to His image and likeness," which does not certainly mean "God created" only a certain part of man, but man entire. Though the act of forming "the body of the slime of the earth" is less creative than the act by which He created the soul out of nothing, because it was from pre-existent matter, yet the unison of both into one human nature is still independent of any concurrent, intermediate cause. Thus, too, "God in a wonderful manner united two distinct elements into *one human person*."<sup>3</sup> I lay particular stress on this last remark, because in the physical order the individual human nature is the human person, whatever distinction may be claimed for them in the abstract.<sup>4</sup> There are in reality no two natures in man

1 See "De hominis creatione et natura"—cap. II,—C. v. p. 554, and same page "Relatio de cap. secundo.

2 Eccles. vii, 30.

3 "In Historiam Mosaic."—Joh. Bap. Pianciani, § J., p. 182.

4 Nothing derogatory to the human nature in Christ follows from this, as all those know who are conversant with the doctrine of its personality in Christ.

—“animality and rationality,” though body and soul are two distinct elements. The soul being the *ratio formalis*, is the *unum principium vite* of the body.

This function of the soul was already clearly enunciated in other dogmatic enactments previous to the Vatican Council.<sup>1</sup> In the discussions and amendments to the chapter referred to it was, therefore, insisted on that the doctrine regarding the soul be qualified specifically in opposition to modern errors. That done, every refuge to the theory of man's evolution would be cut off, and the question as to the immediate creation and infusion of the soul by God in each individual case would be finally settled.

It cannot, I imagine, be objected that, because this chapter was never solemnly promulgated by the Council, one is free to consider the body of man a product of evolution. Such a view appears to be contrary to the obvious teaching of Sacred Scripture, and at variance with the general acceptance of that teaching.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the reason which seems to recommend it principally to scientific men is not certain; at most it is plausible. The construction and development of human organisms though similar in many respects, even like the construction and development of organisms of inferior order, whether the similarity be viewed from the anatomical or historical standpoint, will not place the conclusion of common parentage beyond question. The human body, if a result of transformation, must have passed through all the lower stages of vegetable and sentient life before it reached the perfection which may be called “*necessitans formam ultimam*.” But if it is admitted that “*animam esse causam formalem*,” as it is defined; that the specific principle of life both develops the organs of the individual and conforms itself to them.<sup>3</sup> Always ranging them within

1 See “Adnot. in 15 cap. 3ae partis, etc.” C. v. p. 545, a, and 547 b; 554, c.; 556, b and d.

2 Hurter, *Compend. thes.* 12, note.

3 See “Darwinismo esposto e disanimato,” by Gius. Priscono, “Accademia Rom. di San Tommaso,” vol. ix, p. 274. What scientists now generally think of “spontaneous generation” see in same article p. 271, seq.

the section of life from which they are generated, the organisms of man cannot be the result of a lower principle, though indeed of a higher principle as was the case with the first man, whose body was formed by God "of the slime of the earth," who was furnished by God "with an exquisite and perfect structure of organs by which he would, without doubt, surpass every other living thing."<sup>1</sup>

By excluding the body of man from evolution it does not follow that evolution, on the whole, is irreconcilable "with the doctrine of that Church which is universally known as the most dogmatic, authoritative and uncompromising."<sup>2</sup> The theory is certainly not necessarily wedded to this method of accounting for the existence of the body of man. Nor is it likely that converts to Christianity would be more numerous, or that those who are wavering in the faith would be comforted by the fact that evolution of man's body were admitted.

That the case is possible does not make it probable, particularly when there are definite criteria of a higher order to the contrary.<sup>3</sup> It is only an additional proof of God's love who supplied the uncertainty of scientific inquiry in such important matter by a simple, plain, inspired narrative. If science should ever discover incontrovertible evidence that man's body is the result of evolution from a lower organism, then the Church will determine the true sense of Scripture in this case, but until such time let the sense universally accepted as reasonable prevail.

JOS. SELINGER.

1 See "Varia Postulata Episcop. Neapol. Quoad doctrinam de homine c. iv," C. v. p. 774, d.

2 To exclude the body of man from evolution does not imply that the soul was created before the body was formed by God. See a singular opinion of Philastrius, "In Historiam Mosai," of Pianciani, p. 187. As to the formation of Eve's body by God, there is no doubt.

3 How can it be accounted for that no such evolution of the human body has taken place within the memory or experience of man? If it occurred once, why can it not occur again? The recently advanced theory that man's body was evolved by a freak "per saltum" from a lower species is not very convincing, though it may supply fresh food for speculation to those who are reluctant to admit the more simple explanation that God "made him so."



## CONFERENCES.

**SHOULD THE CONGREGATION STAND OR KNEEL DURING THE  
"CREDO" IN LOW MASS?**

*Qu.* There seems to be a doubt as to the manner in which the faithful are to assist during the recitation of the *Creed* in the low Mass. A different practice prevails in different places. Should the Congregation stand or kneel?

*Resp.* The difference of practice in regard to the posture of the faithful during the recitation of the Creed at low Mass arises from the fact that the *Creed* was originally no integral part of the Liturgy, but was gradually introduced in different countries as a public protest on the part of the faithful against certain local heresies which denied portions of the Apostolic doctrine.

In the Eastern Churches and in Spain the Nicene (Constantinopolitan) Creed was recited as early as the sixth century. During the next two centuries we find it introduced into the liturgies of France and Germany. It became part of the Roman liturgy in the eleventh century on occasion of a visit to Rome of the Emperor Henry II of Germany, who desired to give public evidence of his Catholic faith and adherence to the Roman Church, which latter had never been tainted by heresy. The custom was thenceforth observed by order of Pope Benedict VIII, as part of the liturgy on certain days.

In solemn functions the people, on hearing the *Credo* intoned, stood up; but at private Mass, especially when the catechumens ceased to leave the church after the Gospel, the faithful were not called upon to make this solemn profession. Their presence was an act of private devotion and hence they often remained kneeling when the celebrant recited the Creed

*in silence*, that is to say, without calling upon the faithful present to make any outward profession of their belief beyond that which their devotion indicated. The server too remains kneeling, according to the ancient manner in use in the Roman Church before the Creed was introduced; for then it was frequently the duty of the server to close the gates upon the Catechumens leaving the church at that portion of the liturgy which begins with the Offertory, a duty that ordinarily devolved upon the Deacon.

But whilst there is no liturgical rule fixed for the posture of the faithful during the recitation of the Creed in private Mass, it seems more becoming that they should stand, if they can follow the priest at the altar, unless a contrary custom be observed to avoid confusion. Why?

Because in the first place it is observed in the solemn Mass. Secondly, the nature of the act as a profession of faith seems to call for a standing position. Thirdly, the Creed is to be considered, according to the general view of liturgical writers, as part of the Gospel at which the faithful stand, as if formally to profess their belief in the same. "After the reading of the Gospel," says St. Thomas (IIIpt. 83 q. 4 art.) "the Creed is sung, in which the people show that they assent by faith to Christ's doctrine, and they thus manifest their conviction that their faith is the fruit of the teaching of Christ and the Apostles, in the Catholic Church."

In an old English work on the duties of the Christian in worship, we find the following query and answer.

"Q. Whether do the people stand or kneel at the Creed?

"A. It importeth not much, whether they stand or kneel; but what posture is most congruous? The Rubrick seems to be for kneeling, for it excepts only the Gospel in private Masses. But Durand affirms (L. 4, c. 25) that all ought to stand; because it is all one with the Gospel, or the principal heads of the Gospel. Certainly there is as much reason for standing at the Creed, in the Mass, as at *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, *Nunc dimittis*, as the general custom of the Church, in the divine Office, teaches us. As also at *Te Deum*, and at *S. Athanasius' Creed*, which are but Canticles of praise, and as professions of our faith.

“ Besides the Creed is an homage made to God, like to that which Solomon made, when turning his face, *He blessed all the Church of Israel, which stood before him.* And it is said there *Solomon stood before the Altar of our Lord, in the sight of the assembly of Israel,* and this as long as he made confession of praise to God: but when he was to make prayer to God, as is after said, *He fastened both knees on the ground.* So the priest in the name of the whole Church, standing in the presence of God, doth make homage to God, by profession of the faith; whereto the people joining do stand, as ratifying and approving what he doth.

“ This posture also shows a promptitude and readiness of the mind, to put in execution, what is propounded in the Creed; which is mystically commended unto us by S. Paul. *Stand therefore having your loins girded in truth, clothed with the breastplate of justice, and having your feet shod, to the preparation of the Gospel of peace.* That is, stand ye constant in faith, in opposition to all heresies, believing with all integrity, whatsoever the Church propounds unto you: let your life correspond thereto by Christian practice, with constancy and firmness of mind, walking before God and man uprightly, according to the Evangelical doctrine.”

---

#### THE INDULGENCE OF THE FORTY HOURS' DEVOTION AND THE SICK.

*Qu.* Can the sick, who are unable to visit the Church during the Forty Hours' Adoration, gain the Plenary Indulgence by going to confession and Holy Communion in their homes?

*Resp.* Those who are habitually sick or suffer from chronic disease which prevents their complying with the customary requisite of visiting the Church and of receiving the Holy Communion in order to gain the Plenary Indulgence, may be dispensed from one or both of these obligations if they perform some other work prescribed, according to their ability, by the Confessor. The Decree which granted this privilege originally excepted the members of religious orders from its provisions, because more frequent opportunity was naturally given them of supplying in other ways the loss of the above mentioned indulgences. But Leo XIII has finally removed this restriction so that it applies to all the faithful alike. We give the decrees in question:

Christifideles habitualiter infirmi et e domo egredi impotentes (exceptis iis qui in communitate morantur) acquirere possunt omnes indulgentias, pro quarum acquisitione praescripta est S. Communio et visitatio ecclesiae vel publici oratorii, dummodo vere poenitentes et confessi, ac caeteris omnibus conditionibus absolutis, loco S. Communionis et visitationis alia pia opera a respectivo confessario injungenda fideliter impleant. (S. C. Ind. et. Rel., 18 Sept., 1862.)

For the sick and aged in Religious Communities the like exemption is granted by decree 16 Jan., 1886, which states :

SS. annuit "ut infirmi aut senio confecti in communitate et sub regula viventes qui ecclesias aut oratoria visitare aliave pro indulgentias praescripta exequi non possunt indulgentias nihilominus lucrari valeant adimplendo alia pia opera confessarii arbitrio praescribenda."

This includes evidently every kind of work which may be ordinarily prescribed but which the sick person cannot perform—except confession. And for those who are dying and cannot even make a confession—provision is made by the Plenary Indulgence in "articulo mortis."

---

#### THE VICAR GENERAL AND THE DIOCESAN CONSULTORS.

*Qu.* REV. AND DEAR SIR :

When a diocesan Consultor is made Vicar General, does he still continue to be a Consultor, or is another one to be appointed in his place ?

The question is asked because, although common sense objects to one being a consultor to himself,—and although it is established by law that "Episcopus et ejus Vic. Generalis servatis servandis, sunt una eademque persona . . ." anyhow, there is a number of dioceses in the U. S., where the V. G. is reported by the Directory as being a diocesan consultor.

*Resp.* In the United States the Vicar General is *ipso facto* a member of the Board of Diocesan Consultors holding a similar relation to that body as the Bishop. Hence he is never eligible for the office of consultor by the clergy, as his official rank gives him the right of presence at the formal councils of the Bishops.

**CREMATION AGAINST THE WILL OF THE DECEASED.**

From several decrees given at length in a former number of this REVIEW, Vol. IV, p. 18, it is evident that the Church does not sanction the practice of cremation.

But these decrees refer to those only who order or express a wish that their bodies be cremated. Those whose bodies are cremated contrary to their intention or by the will of another, are not included in the prohibition and consequently are not to be deprived of Christian burial.

The following case furnishes an application of the above principle.

A prominent man, for many years a stranger to the Church of his childhood, dies repentant and fortified with the Sacraments of the Church. His wife and children, who are non-Catholics and imbued with all the liberal principles of modern civilization, resolve to have his body cremated, although the dying man expressed the wish to be buried according to the rites of the Catholic Church. The family inform the pastor of their intention to have the body cremated. Anticipating difficulties, he consults the Ordinary and receives the answer to perform the rites of the Catholic Ritual over the body: and for the rest to prevent, as best he can, any possible scandal.

The pastor in virtue of this answer blesses the corpse at the house of the deceased, celebrates Mass over the remains and performs the final funeral services over the ashes "*tanquam corpore præsentè*" at the crematory, after which the ashes are placed in the vault.

How far was this action on the part of the priest warranted by the law of the Church?

In answer we have a decision of the Sacred Congregation of Inquiry, dated December 15, 1886, which declares that the rites of the Church may be performed over such as are to be cremated by the will or order of another, both in the house of the deceased and in the church itself, "*remoto scandalo.*" These are the words of the decree: "*Ritus et suffragia iis adhiberi possunt tum domi, tum in ecclesia, non autem usque ad locum cremationis, remoto scandalo.*"

The scandal, however, may be removed, *e. g.* if the fact was announced in the local papers, or if it be known to the parishioners that the deceased was cremated, not at his own request, but by the order of his friends.

D'Annibale says (Vol. I, No. 116): "Eos qui non sua, sed aliena voluntate cremantur, ritu catholico efferre, eis que in ecclesiis justa persolvere, et licet et oportet."

But it is not permissible, as is plain from the restricting words of the S. Congregation, to accompany the body to the crematory; not even "vel civiliter comitari"; or to convey the ashes to the place of burial "ecclesiastico modo"; or, when the ashes have been deposited, to perform the funeral rites, "as if the body were present." The burial of the ashes in a consecrated place is, however, perfectly lawful, since the deceased cannot be deprived of this just privilege by reason of the impiety of those who commanded that the incineration should take place.

From this it follows that the corpse of one who is to be cremated *against his will* may be blessed "domi et in ecclesia" *ante cremationem*, and that the ashes, *post cremationem*, may be placed in consecrated ground.

The pastor, therefore, acted contrary to ecclesiastical law by going to the crematory to perform the rites of the Church.

P. H.

---

### WHO IS SAINT ARTHUR?

*Qu.* It occurs quite frequently that persons select the name of *Arthur* for a child when it is brought to baptism. Although the name figures largely in the legendary lore of the Middle Ages I have never been able to find any authentic account of a saint by that name. Neither the Roman Martyrology nor Butler's "Lives of the Saints," make any mention of it. Can you throw some light upon the subject?

*Resp.* According to Stadler (Heiligen-Lexicon) who has made careful investigation in regard to the origin of the name, there exists no authentic account of a Saint Arthur.

Nevertheless the name has been very popular at all times since the introduction of Christianity into England. It was probably adopted to honor the memory of King Arthur who is supposed to have rallied the British tribes in defence of Christianity, during the sixth century. The accounts concerning this king are on the whole mythical and have come to us mainly through the stories of the early troubadours. The Bollandists do not mention the name among canonized or beatified saints of the Church.

Mgr. Guériu (in his *Petits Bollandistes*) gives however a brief account of a Franciscan monk from Duai, by name of Arthur Bell, who suffered martyrdom in London during the persecutions of the English Reformation. He is commemorated on the fifteenth of December.

The same authority places among the list of those who died with the reputation of sanctity, although not canonized, the celebrated Irish Franciscan, Father Arthur O'Leary, who died about the end of the last century, and whose heroic labors in behalf of the temporal as well as eternal salvation of his people, are cherished in his native city of Cork, and commemorated by a beautiful monument, which the Marquis of Hastings erected in San Pancras, Euston Road, London. The name of Father Arthur O'Leary occurs in the Hagiography on the eighth of January.

It is needless to say that, in conjunction with the name of some other canonized patron saint, the use of Arthur in the baptismal form offers no objection.

---

#### WAS THE FIRST MARRIAGE VALID ?

*Qu.* Paul, having for years neglected the sacraments of his Church and joined the Masonic Lodge, is married to Bertha, a Methodist, before the Methodist minister. At the time of a mission Bertha becomes a Catholic, and Paul also resolves to abandon the secret societies and to return to his religion. On the day on which

they are both to be publicly reconciled to the Church and admitted to the sacraments, I learn :

1. That Bertha had been married before to a man who afterwards abandoned her, fled to Mexico in order to escape civil charges of bigamy, and of whom, since her divorce from him several years ago, she had heard nothing. She does not know whether he was a baptized Christian or not.

2. That Bertha in contracting her second marriage had acted in good faith, thinking that, since she had obtained a legal divorce from her first husband, she was free to marry again. The Methodist minister, before whom she contracted with Paul, confirmed her, she says, in this belief. Paul, too, thought his marriage with her perfectly valid.

Considering that the first marriage might have been invalid because of the doubtful baptism of the fugitive husband, and finding moreover that it is practically impossible to ascertain anything positive about his life or domicile, I conclude that the present marriage may be judged lawful and consequently admit the parties to the sacraments.

Was this right?

*Resp.* The doubt as to whether the marriage between Paul and Bertha may be considered lawful and valid depends on the validity or invalidity of Bertha's first marriage with the fugitive to Mexico of whose present existence no clue can be obtained.

A marriage is considered valid

- a. When *either* of the two contracting parties are baptized ;
- b. When *both* of them are baptized ;
- c. When the baptism of *one is doubtful*, and that of *the other certain* ;
- d. When the baptism of *both is doubtful*.

In the matter of marriage, doubtful baptism (whether it regards the *fact* of having been administered, or only the *validity* of its administration) is *equivalent to certain baptism*, and, until disproved by positive evidence, renders the contract valid. "Toties supponi debet baptismum, quoties positivis aut ineluctabilibus probationibus non extenditur, illud nullatenus aut non rite fuisse collatum. Proinde in dubio



standum est pro valore ac legitimitate matrimonii." (Ball. Opus Mor. Vol. vi, Tr. x, n. 1075).

Unless, therefore, Bertha can positively state she was *not* baptized when she contracted her first marriage—an item which is not mentioned in the case—her second marriage must be considered invalid until proof can be brought that

- a. Either her first husband had not been baptized at the time; or
- b. That he is dead.

The evidence of the death of the first husband must be supported by documents which establish a moral certitude of the fact; that is to say, it excludes proofs consisting of a general rumor, suspicion or what is commonly called simple probability.

Neither the doubt about the baptism, nor the fact that Bertha in her attempted second marriage acted in good faith, nor the uncertainty of her first husband's existence, establish a sufficiently safe title to pronounce a union as severed, which was contracted with full deliberation and no doubt in good faith. It is the office of the Church to protect the definite rights of either party against all uncertainty and doubts until they can be cleared away by some positive evidence.

The conclusion, therefore, is that the second marriage, under the given conditions, is invalid.

As to what a pastor should do in a case where the unexpected separation of two persons, who have lived for years as legitimately married; would cause public scandal and injury to their good name—theology provides the resources of prudent action. The "*usus matrimonii*" would, after proper explanation of the state of the case, have to be interdicted by the confessor. Outwardly such persons could dwell together as husband and wife "*nisi id offerat proximum periculum peccati.*" The frequent and worthy use of the Sacraments of Penance and holy Communion would probably render such danger remote. In the mean time *a certainty that Bertha or else her first husband was never baptized before they separated* might be obtained, which would favor the second marriage.

## IS THE SECOND MARRIAGE VALID?

*Qu.* A baptized Episcopalian, divorced before a civil court from his first wife wishes to marry a Catholic girl. He is unable to say whether his first wife be living, nor whether she had ever been baptized. As he can give no clue which might throw light upon the validity of the first marriage or prove the death of his first wife I declare to the parties that I cannot marry them. Subsequently I learn that they went to the civil magistrate to be married.

Could this marriage be considered valid on the ground that the former nuptials cannot be proved to have been absolutely valid?

*Resp.* In order that a presumable marriage can be annulled *positive* proof must be brought to attest its *invalidity*. All doubts regarding it are to be interpreted in favor of validity. (See the principles laid down in the preceding case.)

---

 A GUARANTEE AGAINST DIVORCE "A VINCULO."

*Qu.* Your solution of the "Mixed Marriage" case in the April number of the REVIEW, though otherwise most instructive, appears to me to have scarcely met the principal difficulty.

John, being a Methodist, wishes to marry Mary, a Catholic. He himself believes that absolute divorce is lawful, as is shown by the fact that he had previously had recourse to the civil courts for divorce from his first wife, now dead. The suspicion might therefore be justly entertained that *he might not have the intention of contracting indissolubly*. Without such intention, I take for granted, his marriage with Mary would be only pretended and hence *invalid*, even though a dispensation had been granted in the impediment of *disparitas cultus* or *mixta religio*, as the case might be.

My question then was this: Would there be any use in asking for dispensation in such a case, or *what guarantee should John give that he had changed his views regarding the indissolubility of marriage, and that he now intends to contract indissolubly with Mary*. Something more than his mere word would appear necessary, for he may have told his first wife as well as Mary that he would be eternally faithful to her, whilst the latter has no more reason to place implicit confidence in his protestations of love than his first wife had.

*Resp.* We certainly did not think that the question was meant to emphasize a doubt regarding the validity of the marriage-tie, such as might arise from a belief that it is soluble by divorce *a vinculo*. The reason must be plain upon consideration.

Whatever a non-Catholic may believe regarding the lawfulness of divorce, he cannot remain ignorant, if he comes to the priest in order to marry a Catholic, that the Church does not admit the union, except on the condition of absolute indissolubility. In the first place the attitude of the Church and of Catholics on the subject of divorce is generally known and daily demonstrated wherever Catholics are to be found. Secondly, the priest to whom the parties come is supposed to remove all doubt about the matter by a preliminary instruction. Lastly, the rite itself explicitly declares the marriage to be "for better, for worse, until death do us part."

The very act, therefore, of a non-Catholic contracting marriage with a Catholic in presence of a priest, is not only an implied but public renunciation, then and there, of any intention to contract with a view to possible separation. His *present intention* is plainly manifested and is stronger than that which may be awakened by his general *belief*, at least so far as the validity of this present contract is concerned.

Nor would any guarantee in writing, or otherwise, prove a better evidence of his present intention than the official witnessing by a minister of the Catholic Church whose doctrine is universally acknowledged, together with the fact that the mutual consent of the parties could never have been entered upon the marriage register of the parish—except on the sole condition of its indissoluble character. No argument or authority in law could overthrow or explain away the full and clear meaning of this testimony.

But suppose even that the non-Catholic party was not instructed in the true nature of the marriage contract as viewed by Catholics, and that he actually believed at the time that some day he might be divorced from his wife, the marriage would still be presumed as valid, for the simple reason that

a *belief* is not equivalent to an *intention*. Unless the non-Catholic *declare* his formal intention that he will not contract indissolubly, he must be presumed to wish to contract a true marriage; and a true marriage means, in its ordinary and Christian sense, an inseparable union. He accepted the conditions, which are universal, without protest, and he bound himself, despite the erroneous notion that the contract might be broken. Had he spoken out his mind, the marriage would never have been entered by the Catholic party. We might cite numerous authorities in support of this view of the question. Benedict XIV and Pius VI are equally pronounced on the subject. The latter says: *Si nulla fuit apposita expressa conditio repugnans substantiæ matrimonii, licet contrabentes generatim intendant contrabere juxta placita sectæ aut legis concedentis dissolutionem vinculi conjugalis, nihilominus matrimonium valide contractum censendum erit, ideoque ortum perpetuum vinculum conjugale.* (Conf. Gury-Ballerini, Tract. de matrim. Vol. ii, n. 752, aduct. ad Resp. I, a.)

Theologians naturally concur in this view, and hence we saw no reason for entering, as our reverend inquirer apparently wished us to do, upon the question of validity on the ground of doubtful intention.

---

#### THE STIPEND IN THE CASE OF BINATION.

*Qu.* Can a priest when he is obliged to duplicate, accept a stipend for either one of the two Masses?

Having said the first Mass on Sunday, without stipend, can he accept a stipend for the second Mass when presented to him between the first and second Mass? (See Lehmkuhl, ii vol. pag. 161.)

*Resp.* The law which forbids a priest to accept any stipend for a second Mass is so well known that we presume the difficulty in the above query turns about the literal application of the word *secunda* in the clause, "constans

autem est prohibitio pro secunda missa," which is to be found on the page referred to in Lehmkuhl. In other words: Whether it is always the *second* Mass for which no stipend may be accepted, or whether the order of the Mass for which a stipend is received may not for good reason be inverted.

There can be no doubt that the word *secunda* used by Lehmkuhl means *one of the two Masses*. Ballerini expresses it: "Lex manet prohibens ne pro *altera* missa stipendium accipiatur," which is less liable to be misconstrued by those who adhere to the letter. It is certainly lawful with us to receive a stipend for the second Mass after the first has been said without such.

---

#### OUR "CASUS DE ECTOPICIS SEU EXTRA-UTERINIS CONCEPTIBUS."

The subject of "a new physiological and moral problem," discussed in our pages (Nov., 1893-Jan., 1894), has called forth an able and exhaustive critique from a Roman theologian in the February and March issues of the *Revue Romaine* (Analecta Ecclesiastica). The writer, P. Alphonse Eschbach, Rector of the French Seminary in Rome, and author of "*Disputationes physiologico-theologicae*" (Paris, 1884), and several important monographs on the subject of embriotomy, etc., takes exception to the preliminary solution of the case given by D. A., and answers the difficulty in two propositions as follows:

*Propositio I. Cum, natura ipsa duce, primis temporibus verae praegnationis, vel uterina sit vel ectopica, nonnisi probabilia signa dentur, mulier quae talia prae se fert, ut praegnants habenda in praxi est.*

Rejecting the conclusion, "donec incerta est praegnatio, probabilior est existentia tumoris," the author sums up: Vel Lucas medicus consueta apud mulierem praegnationis probabilia signa, post sufficientem indagationem, desse judicabat et tunc, gravi ob tumorem instante (quod tamen periti facile non admittunt) vitae matris periculo, contra legem moralem pecasse non videtur.

Vel ipse de probabilibus consuetis praegnationis signis

non curavit, aut ea animadvertens parvi duxit, et tunc male egit.

The second proposition argues against the view which considers the *foetus ectopicus* as unjustly attacking the maternal life: *Nulla probabili ratione fulcitur, imo amplius defendi nequit sententia tenens ectopicos foetus haberi posse tamquam vitæ matris aggressores.* The writer therefore disapproves the advice given by the confessor (Damianus) to Lucas, the physician who consults him.

But P. Eschbach finds in P. Lehmkühl's argument a thesis distinctly in favor of the *procuratio abortus*, and of this he expresses his unqualified disapprobation. P. Lehmkühl maintains that the excision of a foetus (immature) is not necessarily a direct killing of the same and therefore reasons: "Ex consulto abortum inducere etiam licere videtur in præsentî vitæ maternæ discrimine, quod per solam foetus immaturi ejectionem averti potest." He applies this principle to the case in question. The learned Roman theologian takes the opposite view and in its defence lays down the following four propositions which he supports by plausible argument:

PROPOSITIO I.—*Non iis incumbit onus probandi, qui abortum universim illicitum censent, sed qui hoc ex consulto aliquando induci licite posse contendunt.*

PROPOSITIO II.—*Sententia quæ tenet, ex consulto abortum inducere, vel ut in præsentî vitæ discrimine mater salvetur, vel ne in futurum tale discrimen injiciatur, licitum esse, totius catholice scholæ doctrinæ contradicit.*

PROPOSITIO III.—*Seclusis jam argutiis ad cohonestandam craniotomiam olim productis, nulla etiam tenuiter probabili ratione evincitur, licitum esse unquam ex consulto procurare abortum.*

PROPOSITIO IV.—*“Ex consulto abortum inducere in vitæ maternæ discrimine quod per solam foetus immaturi ejectionem averti pöset,” chirurgica operatio est directe occisiva foetus, quam ullo in casu esse licitam tuto amplius doceri nequit.*

The arguments advanced in support of these propositions

are clear and direct. P. Eschbach maintains that the act of cutting and separating the *placenta* is directly killing, inasmuch as it is to the foetus an organ of respiration and nutrition, the same as the lungs and stomach are to the child after birth. To destroy the *placenta* is therefore to take away not only the immediate means of living but to destroy a vital organ of the foetus just as is done if you pierce the lungs or heart or head of the infant. Yet without severing or destroying the *placenta* it is impossible to bring the child to life or to deliver the mother from danger. Nor does the fact that death does not follow immediately render the act less directly privative of life.

We are awaiting the expression of P. Lehmkühl, with whom mainly our writer takes issue, in order to sum up the theological opinion on the subject in a following number of the REVIEW.

---

#### EXAMINATIONS OF THE JUNIOR CLERGY.

*Qu.* Editor AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR :

Please find enclosed a circular from our Rt. Rev. Bishop based on principles of two Councils. The following questions have arisen in this diocese regarding the proper application of the decrees referred to :

1. Is a priest ordained over five years obliged to attend the examination?

2. What is the meaning of the passage in the Third Plenary Council n. 187. and the Provincial Council of Cincinnati IV, c. 5, n. 1. "per quinquennium *saltem* a die suscepti presbyteratus."

3. If "saltem" means that the Bishop may require examination for six, seven or more years, what is the meaning of The Plenary Council, n. 188 and the Cincinnati Council c. II, "si quis forsan quaestionibus propositis, uti par est, non satisfecerit, quinque annis elapsis, tot iteratis examinibus subjiciatur quot nulla vel insufficientia ab examinadoribus fuerint declarata?" If the Bishop has already the power of extending the examination for the clergy beyond five years there seems to be no purpose in n. 188 of the Council. In our case no one has been proved unsatisfactory, yet his Lordship exacts attendance at the examinations from those ordained more than five years. I append the episcopal letter.

## DILECTE NOBIS IN CHRISTO :

Hucusque nobis visum est conciliorum Plen. Balt. III et Prov. Cinc. IV decreta de juniore clero examinando nondum obligare. Pro hujus enim dioecesis conditione neopresbyteri, arduis ac ab invicem dissitis missionibus praefecti, curis rerum tum temporalium tum spiritualium vix pares erant, nedum multum studiis operam dare possent. Hodie vero, clero jam aucto, neosacerdotes pastoribus adsignantur in adiutorium vel missionibus minus latis limitibus circumscriptis praeficiuntur. Hinc penes eos est, quae, dum in Seminario Majori studiorum curriculum percurrerent, didicerant, altius menti insculpere atque magis magisque excolere. Quantum vero examen ad animum studiis apponendum alliciendumque conferat, neminem latet.

Praehabito ergo consultorum consilio statuimus : Sacerdotes, post Concilii Pl. Balt. III promulgationem in festo Epiphaniae Domini, anno 1886 factam ordinati, suae doctrinae specimina in scriptis lingua Latina dabunt in aedibus nostris ab hora nona matutina ad horam primam postmeridianam, feriae tertiae, hebdomadis secundae post Pascha.

## MATERIA EXAMINIS.

I. Theologia Dogmatica : Tractatus de Revelationis Christianae Apologia et Tractatus de Divinae Revelationis Fontibus. (Hurter.)

II. Theologia Moralis : Tractatus de Actibus Humanis, de Conscientia, de Legibus, de Peccatis et de Virtutibus. (Sabetti.)

III. Jus Canonicum : Titulus Secundus Conc. Pl. Balt. III, de Personis Ecclesiasticis ; et Titulus Secundus Conc. Prov. Cinc. IV, De Disciplina Ecclesiastica.

Datum ex Aedibus Nostris, die 30a Novembris, anno 1893.

✠ N. N., *Episcopus N.*

*Resp.* The Council of Baltimore provides for *five* years annual examinations of *all* the junior clergy leaving the Bishop the right to fix at his discretion a longer term. This is the meaning of "*saltem.*"

The next clause in the decrees of the Council refers not to *all* the junior clergy as a body, but to *individual* priests who happen to fail at the examination in the fifth year. These may be remanded for further examination. Where the Bishop fixes a different limit, *i.e.*, six or more years, it means that *all* the junior clergy are to continue the test, which still



leaves intact the special decree of remanding for further examination those who fail.

There is no contradiction or repetition in the two laws which provide for distinct classes.

---

### CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

It may be permitted us to call attention to the recent noble profession, by the English Episcopate, of Catholic principle in reference to national education. To American Catholics who have had reason to be grateful for the religious liberty which they enjoy, the unanimous action of the English Bishops under presidency of Cardinal Vaughan, must be something of a humiliation when we reflect on the attempts made continually, in our midst, to exalt a compromise-system of public education which not only excludes religious teaching from the class-room, but bids solemnly consecrated teachers of religion to hide their sacred profession from their own pupils.

The following are some of the Resolutions of the Catholic Archbishop and Bishops of England on Public Elementary Education, adopted at a meeting during Low Week of this year :

That it is a right and duty, given to parents by their Creator, wherever such natural right has not been forfeited, to secure and watch over the education of their children in that which they believe to be the true religion.

That no plea on behalf of educational uniformity, and no decision by any majority of votes, can alter or abrogate this fundamental natural law, which the Legislature and the people of this country are equally bound to respect and observe.

That, in the nature of things, it can never tend to the happiness, the welfare, or the permanent advantage of a State to disregard, and in practice to outrage, a law of nature, such as the right of parents over the education of their children, be the injury brought about directly, or indirectly, by a process of law, or by a process of privation and exhaustion.

That, while political power and the responsibilities of self-government are more and more devolving upon the masses of the people, and while obvious dangers menace the future of society, it is to the

country's highest advantage that religious principles of life and conduct should be deepened and strengthened in the souls of all during the period of elementary education ; and that these advantages can be adequately secured, so far as the education of Catholics is concerned, only by Catholic public elementary schools, conducted under Catholic management.

*That Catholic parents cannot in conscience accept or approve for their children a system of education, in which secular instruction is wholly divorced from education in their religion.*

That the only system of religious education which Catholic parents can accept for their children is that given under the authority and direction of the Catholic Church, which they believe that Christ Himself has appointed to teach all those things which He has revealed.

That to take the management of schools intended for Catholic children out of the hands of those who represent the religious convictions of their parents, and to place it in the hands of public ratepayers who cannot represent those convictions, is a violation of parental rights, to be resisted as an unwarrantable attack upon religious liberty and upon a fundamental law of nature.

That compulsory State education is an intolerable tyranny, unless due regard be paid by the State to the education of the children in their own religion.

That the *doctrinaire* assumption, presented to the people as axiomatic, *viz.*, that a contribution from the rates to a school invests the ratepayers with a right, never claimed on behalf of taxpayers, to supersede the natural responsibility of control invested in the parents, is preposterous, unjust, and contrary to fact.

Where, however, Protestant parents are satisfied to devolve their natural rights and responsibilities on School Boards elected by ratepayers, believing that these will sufficiently provide for the education of their children, Catholics have no desire to interfere with an arrangement that satisfies the religious conviction of a large number of their countrymen ; but they demand that their own religious convictions shall be equally respected.

We have given the words of the document, omitting only such portions of it as refer to the claim of the English Catholics to share in a just distribution of the Public Elementary School Fund, a claim which, however just, prudence seems to forbid American Catholics to make in behalf of their own schools.

## ANALECTA.

**MATRIMONIA CORAM MINISTRO ACATHOLICO.**

(E. S. POENITENTIARIA.)

*De reconciliatione catholicorum qui coram ministro acatholico matrimonium contraxerunt.*

BEATISSIME PATER :

Ex decreto S. Officii d. 29 Augusti 1888 compertum fuit catholicos, qui coram ministro acatholico matrimonium contrahunt, in excommunicationem S. Sedi reservatam incidere. Quorum absolutio non leves confessariis affere solet difficultates et animi angustias. Nimirum agitur de poenitentibus in fide admodum infirmis qui plerumque per plures annos poenitentiam et confessionem intermiserunt, quique nisi leniter tractentur, vel ob defectum iurisdictionis in aliud tempus differantur, redire ad confessionem non solent. Quo fit ut non solum ipsi ab Ecclesia alienentur, nonnunquam etiam fide deficient et pereant, sed etiam eorum proles in haeresi educuntur. Quam plurimarum animarum ruinam considerantes et dolentes Episcopi Bavariae nuper Frisingae conventum agentes, me infra-scriptum episcopum Eystettensem Romam ad. s. limina proficiscentem rogarunt, ut omnium nomine apud Sanctitatem Tuam pro opportuno remedio supplicem assisterem. Cum ex folio triennialium facultatum Episcopis a S. Poenitentiaria potestas fiat absolvendi (servatis servandis) quoscumque poenitentes (exceptis publicis sive publice dogmatizantibus) a quibusve censuris . . . ob haereses tam nemine audiente quam coram aliis externatas, hanc tamen facultatem solis vicariis foraneis et praeterea aliquibus confessariis specialiter subdelegandis communicare possunt. Rogant igitur iidem Episcopi, ut Sanctitas Tua, ob gravissimas causas supra expositas, sibi concedere dignetur, ut facultatem ab haeresi seu a favore haeresis absolvendi omnibus confessariis habitualiter subdelegare possint, cum de iis poenitentibus agitur, qui ob matrimonium coram ministro haeretico celebratum in censuram inciderunt, nisi res iam ad contentiosum iudicium Ordinarii sit deducta. Quam facultatem huiusmodi poenitentes absolvendi non in destructionem, sed in aedificationem futuram esse, Episcopis oratoribus plane persuasum est. Sanctitatis Tuae.

Humillimus et obedientissimus filius et servus.

FRANCISCUS LEOPOLDUS, *Epis. Eyst.*

Romae, die 29 April 1893.

Sacra Poenitentiarum Venerabili in Christo Patri Episcopo Eystetensi benigne indulget iuxta preces, durantibus facultatibus pro foro interno Episcopis concessis.

Datum Romae in S. Poenitentiarum, die 27 Junii 1893.

N. AVERARDIUS, *S. P. Reg.*

A. C. MARTINI, *S. P. Secretarius.*

**CONVALIDANTUR OMNES ERECTIONES CONFRATERNITATUM SSmi  
ROSARII, USQUE NUNC IRRITE FORSAN ERECTARUM.**

BEATISSIME PATER :

Fr. Vincentius Leo Sallua Archiep. Calcedonen O. P. ad Sacri Pedis osculum provolutus, Sanctitati Vestrae exponit ut sequitur. Plurimae sunt in Orbe toto SSmi Rosarii Confraternitates de quibus, vehemens enascitur dubium, utrum rite fuerint erectae (attentis formalitatibus canonicis quae erectionem praecedere et sequi debent). Unde, ad evitandum grave damnum quod imminet iis Christifidelibus qui adscripti praedictis Confraternitatibus sic invalide erectis non amplius lucrarentur Indulgentias a SS. Pontificibus elargitas, Orator S. V. deprecatur ut dignetur generalem concedere sanationem in favorem omnium praedictarum Confraternitatum usque nunc erectarum.

Et Deus.

Ex Audientia SSmi diei 28 Sept., 1893, SSmus D. N. Leo Papa XIII petitam sanationem benigne concessit.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria S. C. Indulg. Sacrisque Reliq. Praepositae die 28 Sept., 1893.

FR. IGNATIUS, *Card. PERSICO, Praefectus.*

✠ *Archiep. NICOPOLITAN., Secretarius.*

## BOOK REVIEW.

**RATIONAL PHILOSOPHY: THE LAWS OF THOUGHT OR FORMAL LOGIC.** By William Poland, Professor of Rat. Phil. in St. Louis University, pp. 104.—Silver Burdett & Co., New York, Boston, Chicago : 1892.

**CURSUS PHILOSOPHICUS IN USUM SCHOLARUM AUCTORIBUS PLURIBUS PHILOSOPHIAE PROFESSORIBUS IN COLLEGIIS.** Exaetensi et Stonyhurstensi, S.J. **ONTOLOGIA.**—Auctore Carolo Frick, S.J., pp. viii, 203. Pr. \$1.00. **PHILOSOPHIA NATURALIS.**—Auctore Henr. Haan, S.J., pp. viii, 219. Pr. \$1.00. Herder : Freiburg, St. Louis, Mo. 1894.

**FUNDAMENTAL ETHICS.**—For use in classes of Moral Philosophy by William Poland, pp. 138. Silver Burdett & Co. 1894.

**THE DATA OF MODERN ETHICS EXAMINED.**—By Rev. John J. Ming, S.J. pp. xx, 386. Benziger Bros., N. Y. 1894.

## I.

Though not forming a complete course of philosophy, there is a certain gradation in this collection of recent works on that subject which warrants our grouping them in one general survey. The beginner in the study of "wisdom," the progressing, the proficient, each can find here something to help him onward.

However much we may deplore the necessity which brings about the great evil that lurks in the little book on large subjects, we are constrained to face the fact that primers and "short cuts" in every department of knowledge are the demand of the rushing times. The novel may still trail its slow length through a triplet of volumes, but the days of folios for philosophy and theology are going or gone. Well, let us have our little books well made, and the lover of medieval tomes will try to be resigned to the inevitable.

The first of the works on our present list is such a book. Its

maker knows how to build compactly, to economize space, to furnish without overcrowding his apartments. He professes to deal with the bare essentials of formal logic, and protests against his treatise being regarded as a "Logic made easy," or a "Logic in Twenty Lessons without a Master." "In philosophy less than in other things," he says, "can we profitably dispense with a master," nor need we go beyond the first introductory article of his own book to find an object lesson of the necessity of the *adfer magistrum*, to show the difference between science and art, under either or both of which species of mental habits logic finds a place. We venture, however, to assert that there are few manuals of logic to which the constant assistance of a teacher is less indispensable than the one before us. A firm, comprehensive grasp of his subject as a whole, a sharp outlining of its essential and integral parts, admirable clearness of definition and exposition of details, felicity of illustration—these mental endowments of the author are stamped on his work. These perfections have been brought out into bold relief by the printers' art, making the book attractive to the eye, and admirably adapted as a text for the teachers' use.

## II.

The next two works on our list form the third and fourth installments of a complete course of philosophy now being produced by a number of professors amongst the German Jesuits. The Logic and Ethics have already appeared, the latter having been noticed in a previous issue of this REVIEW. The psychology and natural theology are promised for the near future. These manuals may be regarded as companions in Latin garb to the Stonyhurst series in English. The connection, however, between the two series is no closer than that which rests on the identity of general subject matter. It were very desirable that a series of Latin hand-books should be written, knitting in strong scholastic fashion the loosely woven material of the English series. The more discursive character of the latter adapts them as excellent supplementary reading to a more rigid course. As yet amongst the score of Latin texts we have not one especially adapted to the peculiar wants of English speaking students.

Fr. Frick, in his Ontology follows the well known lines of all similar treatises. Being, as transcendental, as divided into the Aristotelian categories, and as the subject of the larger perfections, limits the range of his speculation. The impress of the Suarezian mind is

evident in his handling of the subtle questions on the concept of being, the principle of individuation, the distinction between essence and existence in creatures. On the latter point, however, the mind and words of St. Thomas are claimed as not favoring a real distinction.

On the objectivity of substance, Locke is made to bear as usual the onus of negating. The author of the *Essay on the Human Understanding* is indeed responsible for much mischief in the history of philosophy. As Cardinal Zigliara pithily says of him, he may have been an *optimus medicus* but he certainly was a *pessimus philosophus*. That the latter epithet is not undeserved is plain enough from his contradictory statements regarding the subject before us; still, on the whole, his mind, as gathered from a complete reading of his treatment of the matter, does not seem to be, as it is so generally said to be, against the objectivity of substance. This remark will also apply to the classing of Locke with Hume as denying the objective reality of efficient causality.

### III.

The next treatise on natural philosophy covers portions of cosmology and psychology. Relegating to natural theology the more abstract questions as to the nature and origin of the universe, Fr. Haan keeps within the rigid limits of his subject matter—the *natura et essentia corporum*—including, however, herein what is quite often referred to psychology, the sub-human *living* world. His method on the whole is inductive, thus giving the lie to the undying calumny that scholastic philosophy follows no path but the subjective and deductive. The phenomena of matter, its extension in place, sensible qualities, movements, actions in living beings—these objects of experience are gathered, carefully scrutinized, sifted and made the starting point and the guiding lines for inductive search into the nature of matter, and giving a national explanation of the essence of corporal substance.

Of these two manuals we may say what we said above of the preceding work on Logic—they are model class-books. Concise, they are never obscure. Woven of the strong truths set forth in the writings of St. Thomas, Suarez and the best of the Neo-scholastics, their authors have known how to adapt them to present needs, showing by the unusually large number of “difficulties” proposed, acquaintance with all that has been suggested yesterday and to-day in opposition to their propositions.

## IV.

Taking up the fourth book on our list, there are some readers who may not care to see moral philosophy cut up into question and answer. But the book before us is not intended for the finished ethicist. It is to meet the wants of the classroom, and there the catechetical form is of service in drawing out the salient aspects and leading principles of the subject taught. It is, moreover, the work of a teacher whom experience has taught the needs of pupils. He has kept before himself a four-fold purpose, "1, to give short, clear definitions of all essential terms; 2, to force into prominence the groundwork and principles of practical science; 3, to illustrate the abstract principles when necessary by examples from which their practical application in other cases may be readily inferred; 4, to concentrate attention upon the fact that there are fixed principles of conduct." What strikes one in reviewing the way in which this scope has been attained is, not so much the author's seizure of his subject in its entirety as his orderly procedure in its exposition. It is to be regretted indeed that he has not enlarged the boundaries of his subject so as to embrace the special duties and rights of the individual and of society. This would have doubled the value of his work. Over the ground, however, which he covers he moves steadily, *non per saltus*. From the first to the last the questions are not simply dovetailed, they are woven. They index a mind that has thought out, not compiled its subject, and from its store draws out just those skeins and hues that are needed to make its design complete as a whole and finished in detail.

Though Fr. Poland's Logic and Ethics are intended for the school or college class, they might serve as introductory helps even for more advanced students as furnishing an easily reached general survey of what, without some such aid it is so difficult to impart—the nature and range of formal logic and general ethics. We trust that the same experienced hand may give us similar digests of the other portions of philosophy.

## V.

We have kept our best book for the last—"The Examination of the Data of Modern Ethics." Formerly and elsewhere Fr. Ming has crossed swords with Mr. Spencer, and those who remember those earlier conflicts in the field of metaphysics will be glad to see them pushed here into the domain of ethics. Here, however,



Herbert Spencer is but one, though a leader, in the opposing hosts. The entire army of Hedonism and Utilitarianism are attacked. The tendency of what passes for the popular philosophy of our day is to undermine the whole fabric of morality. This, of course, is not the avowed purpose of its chiefs, Comte, Mill, Spencer, Bain, Tyndall and Huxley. On the contrary they claim by relegating the supersensible to the unknowable to establish a solid basis for ethics in the world of sense, to set before man an object for his striving that shall be tangible, to emancipate him from the trammels of the old metaphysical shackles called the moral law, by making him realize that such law is but one phase of the "world-process" under which he with universal nature has evolved, is evolving, to find in civil enactments, in social weal, in the conditions of existence, the basis of justice. The beginning, procedure and result of this philosophy are admirably sketched by our author. "Positivists and Agnostics," he says, "proceed from the negation of any firm objective reality; for they deny the self-existent First Cause distinct from the universe, deny the spirituality, immortality and freedom of the soul, deny substance underlying the phenomena whether mental or physical, as their permanent substratum. On a foundation so utterly unreal they build up ethical principles which are altogether untenable, vague, meaningless and self-contradictory. The conclusions thence drawn are of the same kind. They contain no definite moral precepts which must necessarily be obeyed; they lay down no rules which bind the will; establish no authority to which man has to submit; set up no ideals to which he is bound to look up. Every discussion results in doubt; every important question remains unsolved; every duty becomes uncertain; the outlines of the order necessary for man are dim and indiscernable; the goal which we have to reach and the way which we have to pursue are wrapped in darkness. Only one tenet is set forth as certain and undeniable, and is, indeed, deduced with perfect consistency from the first principles. This one tenet is that all firm supports of morality have given way to modern criticism; that since man is independent of a Creator, there is no aim for him above this material world, no law for his will, no certain restraint for his passions, no sacredness of obligation, no responsibility, no fear, no hope beyond the grave." (p. 372.) Serious charges these, and such as demand a mastery of systems as a whole and sustained power to follow them on their way to their outcome.

His purpose is "to analyze and examine the new ethics set forth by

positivists and agnostics and to contrast it with that of the Christian ages which it is said to have supplanted." By Christian ethics he does not mean "a code of revealed moral precepts but a system of moral laws which may be deduced by reason from self-evident principles and from the very nature of things—but by reason developed and matured under the influence of Christianity and no longer groping in the darkness of the pre-Christian era." He compares "these two systems of morals; not from a theological but from a philosophical point of view; for they are opposed to each other chiefly under this aspect. The new moralists, denying the very possibility of a divine, supernatural revelation condemn the Ethics of the Christian ages as being repugnant to reason and based on assumptions and principles repugnant to human nature." His purpose is not "to discuss particular moral duties in detail. Modern ethical speculation being of recent date has not yet had time to mark them out. Thus far scarcely more than the basis has been laid, and this forms the centre of discussion in our day." He therefore "calls to test only the groundwork of the new and the ancient system of morals, and examines only the foundation upon which each of them erects the order of right and duty." He inquires "into which of them recognizing the true nature of man holds up to him the ultimate end corresponding to his innate tendencies, teaches him to distinguish good from evil and virtue from vice, urges him by sacred obligation and effective sanction to strive for the one and to shun the other, proposes to him the true moral ideals that attract him to the highest forms of perfection, and offer a solid foundation to justice and mutual love, the twin bonds of human society. These are the questions we have to treat. Answering them we shall arrive at the data, the fundamental truths, of ethics, now so eagerly sought after, and in the light so gained we shall see whether the old Christian theory has in reality decayed in the course of ages, and whether modern thought has erected a new basis on which a superstructure of pure morality may be safely built" (p. 24). A broad field this, and one which no mere surface harrowing will render fruitful. The plow must go deep into the soil and the husbandman must have a straight eye and a steady hand. Fortunately for the cause of truth Fr. Ming brings these requisites to his work. It would carry us too far from our lines to follow him over the broad range of his subject, nor could we by summaries and excerpts do more than present vague suggestions of his matter and method. Our readers who are interested in ethical

questions (and who are not?) will come themselves to the stream, not to sip but to drink copiously of its invigorating thought. They will find here breadth, depth, limpidity. The moral agent, act, end, law, with their consequences in the spheres of justice and beneficence are searched profoundly. Yet the student's eye that is trained to look below the surface will find its objects in clear light, in distinct outline, in completeness of detail, nor whilst he follows the steady flow of thought will he have his mind distracted by the vague platitudes, or abusive personalities which so often vitiate works of this kind. He will echo too, we doubt not, our hope that Fr. Ming may take up the data of modern economical and political science and submit them to a like examination, and next to this that he or some of his brethren may produce extended critiques of Herbert Spencer's other writings, especially the *Biology, Psychology and Sociology*. Such a task requires much more than keen mental sight. It needs large familiarity with facts, physical, psychical, historical, mythical, fabulous—such as can be gleaned only from well-stored book shelves. Where shall we find a champion for this field?

**DE SCIENTIA MEDIA.—Seu Thomismi cum Molinismo  
Concordia Dissertatio. Auctore Fr. Dr. Zigon, Sacerd.  
archid. Goritiensis.—Goritiae : Typis Hilarianis, 1893.**

The old controversy between the defenders of the *scientia media* and Neo-Thomists arguing in favor of physical predetermination is far from being settled, albeit our illustrious Apostolic Delegate, many years ago, whilst still a Roman professor, predicted its speedy termination. "Certiores nunc fiant," said the eminent lecturer, "quicumque Angelici Praeceptoris instituta prosequi cupiunt, quod forsitan brevi post tempore tam diuturnae dissensiones conticescent : Si ex una parte theologi admittant, Deum a se et in se omnia scire, etiam singulos motus voluntatis, quatenus eorundem sigulorum est causa prima ut sint et liberi exerantur a voluntate humana propter influxum Dei co-operantis : Si ex altera parte theologi dimittant praemotionem eo sensu quod afficiat qualitate praevia nostram voluntatem. Silentibus et in praeteritum consequuntur scientia media et praemotione (non tam dico verba quam significata prout hucusque mentes diviserant), etc." Cf. Satolli : *De gratia Christi* p. x. Since then the contest has been kept up with the earnestness of unvanquished champions on both sides. Our author

places himself on the side of the Molinists, and pronounces without qualification for the *scientia media*. Strangely enough, he does not appeal to or connect himself with the recent leaders in the controversy—the eminent Jesuits, Schneemann and Frins, as opposing the reasoning of the Dominican Dummermuth, or the bantering theologian who undertook to vent his family animosity as much as his theological bias in the first numbers of the *Revue Thomiste* last year. He goes somewhat further back, and makes a treatise as well as a thesis of his subject. Accordingly he first defines the position of the defenders of the *scientia media* as taking a justifiable middle course between the *scientia visionis* and the *scientia simplicis intelligentiae*. He then proves from Sacred Scriptures the science *futurorum conditionatorum*, discusses the indifference of the free will, and then defends the *scientia media* with singular dexterity of argument. The last chapter of this interesting pamphlet treats *De medio scientiae futuribilium liberorum*, in which he concludes that some of the ablest opponents of the theory which admits the *scientia media* are in reality its defenders. Thus he makes not only the learned Cardinal Pecci (*Sentenza di S. Tommaso circa l'influsso di Dio sulle azioni delle creature ragionevoli e sulla scienza media*. Roma, 1885), but Mgr. Satolli contributory to his defense of a position which, he allows, can offer no light to explain the manner of the divine knowledge, yet does not admit of any doubt as to the fact of its existence. “Equidem,” says Dr. Zigon (p. 133), “scientiam mediam admittere malo, quamquam modum ejus ignoro, cum ignorantia modi certitudinem facti non tollat.” The fact consists in the assurance that God not only knows what is merely possible, and what is absolutely to be, but also what would happen under given conditions, as the divine mind is, for instance, spoken in Wisdom iv, 11: “Raptus est ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus, aut ne fictio deciperet animam illius.” The successive operation in the divine knowledge of free human actions would, according to our manner of conceiving them, be represented by the following: “I, *Scientia simplicis intelligentiae*; II, *Scientia media*; III, *Decretum Dei innixum scientiae mediae, qua praelucente et dirigente omnipotentissimam inclinandorum cordium habet potestatem absque humanae libertatis praejudicio*; IV, *Scientia visionis*.”

Although the Thomists, so-called, omit from their system the link of the *scientia media*, our author holds that they do so only in explicit terms. “Omnes illi quoque Theologi qui scientiam mediam una cum praedeterminatione Bannesii impugnant, vel inviti ipsum

scientiæ mediæ spectrum terribile tradunt." For a confirmation of this statement he appeals to the following passage in Card. Pecci (Sentenza di S. Tommaso II n. 17 ; pag. 32 sq.) " La sapienza infinita di Dio richiede ch'egli sappia cosa sarrebbero per fare le creature ragionevoli che mai non esisteranno, o nissun atto libero eserciteranno nello stato di via, come incontra ai fanciulli che muoiono prima dell'uso della ragione." *Ecce*, says our author, *rejectis ab auctore eodem decretis prædeterminantibus scientiam mediæ!* In the same way he cites Mgr. Satolli (De oper. di v. p. 410) as unwittingly conceding the *scientia mediæ*.

We must leave students of this delicate and intricate question to satisfy themselves of the merit of Dr. Zigon's arguments. If he does not settle it he certainly makes a point in favor of the Molinist school of theologians.

**THE NEW KNOW-NOTHINGISM.** By Rev. R. M. Ryan. Pp. 127. Published by the author, 120 West Sixtieth Street New York.

**RELIGION OR NO RELIGION IN EDUCATION.** The Most Important Question of the Hour. By Rev. B. Hartmann, Alton: Mellin & Gaskin. 1894. Pp. 54.

We recommend these two pamphlets as good weapons of defence in the intermittent warfare of bigotry and liberalism to which American Catholics are being provoked by the enemies of true freedom as well as by the false friends of it.

"The New Know-Nothingism" is a clever exposition of the calumnies spread under the auspices of the A. P. A., and its pungent satire, as well as its clearance of the bogus documents published under the name of papal and episcopal decrees, will do much to open the eyes of those who easily believe what they hear to the detriment of the Church.

Fr. Hartmann's brochure is of no little value in bringing the relative merits of the Parochial school system into strong relief. He shows the futility of the attempts to establish a compromise system, even as independent of the fact that it always involves an unpardonable sacrifice of religious principle, unless where dire necessity compel such sacrifice for the sake of self-preservation.

The section (Chapt. vi, part iv), in which he deals with the financial aspect of the projects to divide the school fund, offers some novel points to show the disadvantages under which such a

measure would place American Catholics. The author is an American and speaks with the conviction of a man attached to his country. Our literary societies would do well to secure both pamphlets here mentioned for general distribution among sincere non-Catholics as well as Catholics who need be informed on the topics discussed.

We note, in passing, that the lines on pg. 32 (of "Religion or no Religion") credited to Thomas à Kempis are taken from Ovid (Remed. Amor. v. 92) in which *convalescere* is to be read for "invaluerit."

**"PAX VOBISCUM."** A Manual of Prayers with special devotions for the sick.—London: Burns & Oates. (N. Y.: Benziger Bros.)

A useful and presentable Manual for both the sick and those who attend them. It gives in clear large type a choice collection of morning offerings (together with the Ordinary of the Mass), evening prayers, daily and occasional devotions for the sick and prayers for those near death. The ejaculatory prayers as well as the hymns pregnant with devotional expression, which is not of the sort to weary the sensitive sufferer, have evidently been selected with a practical view to the need of the sick. An alphabetical index of the prayers, and one giving the first lines of the hymns make the little volume a decided treasure for the infirmary. But why must we keep on saying "O Holy St. Francis," when there is no lack of suitable epithets for a saint dear to every Catholic, but holy enough when once holy?

**A BIBLIA DAS ESCOLAS.** Obra novamente refundida para uso das Escolas Catholicas por Gustavo Mey. Versao Portugueza peto Dr. Manuel de Azevedo Aranje e Gama. Illustrata da com numerosas gravuras e com dois mappas da terra sancta. Com approvaçao de 37 prelados.—Friburgo im Brisgau: B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1894.

A Portuguese translation of Gustave Mey's popular Bible history with its clear topical divisions and excellent illustrations must prove a welcome addition to the school literature of the Portuguese provinces, especially in South America whither some 17,000 immigrants stream each year to swell the Iberian population, which is entirely Catholic. The Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon speaks highly of this version, and that should be enough to recommend it, not only at

home and in the New World, but to the three million of Portuguese colonists in Africa and Asia, who lack the mechanical aids which can provide such books as are constantly offered to the Catholics of many lands by the enterprising firm of B. Herder, long distinguished for the excellence of its publications.

---

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- VARIA PIETATIS EXERCITIA ERGA SS. COR JESU**, cum idoneis instructionibus in usum juniorum clericorum, ex libro de Festis utriusque SS. Cordis exscripta a Nicolao Nilles, S.J. Editio quarta.—Oeniponte : Typis et sumpt. Fel. Rauch. 1893.
- A BIBLIA DAS ESCOLAS**. Obra novamente refundida para uso das Escolas Catholicas por Gustavo Mey. Versao Portugueza pelo Dr. Manuel de Azevedo Aranjó e Gama. Illustrada com numerosas gravuras e com dois mappas da terra santa. Com approvaçao de 37 prelados.—Friburgo em Brisgau. B. Herder. St. Louis, Mo. 1894.
- NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRÆCE ET LATINE**. Textum graecum recensuit, latinum ex Vulgata Versione Clementina adjunxit, breves capitulorum inscriptiones et locos parallelas addidit Fridericus Brandscheid, Gymnasii Hadamariensis olim conrector. Cum Approbatione Rev. Archiep. Friburg.—Friburgi Brisgoviae : Sumpt. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. 1893. Pr. \$2.10.
- PROLEGOMENA ZUM GRIECHISCH-LATEINISCHEN N. T.** Handbuch der Einleitung ins Neue Testament. Von Friedrich Brandscheid.—Freiburg im Br., B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. 1893. Pr. \$2.00.
- THE LOVER OF SOULS**. Short Confernces on the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By a Priest.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Bros. 1894.
- THE LIFE OF FATHER CHARLES, C.P** By Rev. Father Austin, C.P.—Dublin : Sealy, Bryers & Walker. (N. Y. Benziger Bros.) 1893.
- OMERO**. L'Iliade con note Italiane del Prof. Ludovico Macinai. Canto I.—Frascati : Collegio di Mandragone. 1894.
- THE AUTHORIZED CATECHISM** of Christian Doctrine. With explanatory notes by Rev. William Byrne, D.D.—Boston : Flynn & Mahony. 1894.
- PATRIOTISM** : Its duty and value. Address by Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D.—New York : The Cath. Book Exchange. 1894.

**THE ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION, REASON AND SCIENCE** all proceeding from the same source. By Thomas O'Neill.—Baltimore : John Murphy & Co. 1894. 32mo. Pr., bd., 40 cents.

**THE INFANT JESUS OF PRAGUE** and its veneration. By Rev. H. Koneberg, O. S. B. Transl. by Rev. Jos. Mayer, C. SS. R.—New York : Joseph Schaeffer. 1894.

**LITTLE TREASURE OF THE DEVOUT CLIENTS OF ST. ANTHONY** of Padua. (Novena.)—Joseph Schaeffer. Pr. \$2.00 a hundred.

**NOVENA IN HONOR OF OUR LADY OF MT. CARMEL.** With notice of the origin, etc., of the Brown Scapular.—Joseph Schaeffer. Pr. \$5.00 a hundred.

**THE LITTLE TREASURY OF LEAFLETS.** Vol. iii.—Dublin : M. & S. Eaton. (N. Y. Benziger Bros.)

**RELIGION OR NO RELIGION IN EDUCATION.** The most important question of the hour. By Rev. B. Hartmann.—Alton : Melling & Gaskins. 1894. Pr. 15 cents.

**THE NEW KNOW-NOTHINGISM.** A Reply to the calumnies of the A. P. A. By Rev. R. M. Ryan. Published by the author, 120 West 60th street, New York.

**GRAMMATICA GRECA** ad uso dei Ginnasi e Licei-composita dai Professore L. Macinai e L. Biacchi. Volume I : Fonologia-Morfologia. Volume II : Sintassi.—Torino : Ermano Loescher. 1893.

**COMMENTARIUS IN EVANGELIUM SECUNDUM MARCUM.** (Cursus Script. S.) Auctore Jos. Knabenbauer, S.J.—Parisiis : P. Le-thielleux. 1894.

**PEARLS FROM FABER.** Selected and arranged by Marion J. Brunowe.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago : Benziger Bros. 1894.

**THE LITTLE PRAYERBOOK OF THE SACRED HEART.** Prayers and Practices of Bl. Margaret Mary Alacoque. Arranged by Rev. Bonavent. Hammer, O.S.F.—Benziger Bros.



# American Ecclesiastical Review.

## CONTENTS---VOL. X.

### JANUARY.

	PAGE.
I. CASUISTRY IN MORAL THEOLOGY, (Art. XVIII of Clerical Studies.)	I
The Very Rev. J. Hogan, D.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.	
II. DISCUSSION OF A NEW MORAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL PROBLEM—Reports of Medical Experts,	12
With an Introduction by the Rev. R. J. Holaind, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.	
III. THE SOLUTIONS OFFERED BY PP. LEHMKUHL, S.J., AND AERTNYS, C.S.S.R.	60
The Editor.	
IV. EXCISIO FÆTUS ATQUE EJUS DIRECTA OCCISIO.—A Rejoinder to the “Animadversiones” of P. Sabetti, S.J.	64
The Rev. Aug. Lehmkuhl, S.J., Exaeten, Holland.	

### FEBRUARY.

I. THE PONTIFICAL ENCYCLICAL “DE STUDIIS SCRIPTURAE SACRAE.”	81
II. THE ENCYCLICAL “PROVIDENTISSIMUS DEUS” and the Professors of S. Scripture in our Seminaries,	107
The Editor.	
III. THE WEAK POINTS OF OUR CATHOLIC PRESS,	117
L. W. Reilly, Hanoverville, Md.	
IV. IMPERFECTIONS IN OUR SYSTEMS OF MORAL THEOLOGY, AND THEIR REMEDIES—(Article XIX of Clerical Studies.	125
The Very Rev. J. Hogan, D.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.	

- V. A TRAINING SCHOOL FOR PAROCHIAL HOUSEKEEPERS. 136  
The Rev. Thomas Jefferson Jenkins, St. Lawrence, Ky.

**MARCH.**

THE MOSAIC HEXAEMERON IN THE LIGHT OF EXEGESIS  
AND MODERN SCIENCE.

The Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., University of Notre Dame,  
Indiana.

- I. MOSES AND SCIENCE. 161  
II. ALLEGORISM AND LITERALISM. 176  
III. ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA AND THE NEBULAR HYPOTHESIS. 177  
IV. ST. AUGUSTINE AND EVOLUTION (Exegesis Old and New). 203  
V. MODERN THEORIES OF COSMOGONY. 217

**APRIL.**

- I. THE GRAND INQUISITOR JEAN BRÉHAL IN THE CASE  
OF JOAN OF ARC, 241  
The Editor.  
II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, 255  
The Rev. Thos. Hughes, S.J., St. Louis University, St.  
Louis, Mo.  
III. THE RUBRICS OF THE MASS, 269  
The Rev. A. Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., St. Joseph, N. B.,  
Canada.  
IV. THE LIMITATIONS OF MORAL THEOLOGY, (Art. XX of  
Clerical Studies,) 277  
The Very Rev. J. Hogan, D.D., Catholic University of  
America, Washington, D. C.  
V. THE NAME OF JOHN IN HAGIOGRAPHY, 288  
The Rev. H. J. Heuser, Overbrook Seminary.

**MAY.**

- I. OUR READING—A CLERIC'S ADDRESS TO HIS LOOKING  
GLASS, 321  
The Rev. Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., St. Joseph, N.B.,  
Canada.  
II. THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS, 329  
Conde B. Pallen, LL.D., Editor of *Church Progress*, St.  
Louis, Mo.  
III. PARTISAN POLITICS IN THE CATHOLIC PRESS, 343  
The Rev. John Talbot Smith, formerly Editor of the  
*Catholic Review*, New York.

IV. THE NEED OF THE CATHOLIC PRESS, Prof. Maurice Francis Egan, LL.D., formerly Editor of the <i>Freeman's Journal</i> , Notre Dame, Indiana.	349
V. THE CATHOLIC PRESS AND EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY.	358
<b>JUNE.</b>	
I. ASCETIC THEOLOGY, (Art. XXI of Clerical Studies.) The Very Rev. J. Hogan, DD., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.	401
II. THE PERPETUAL PRESENCE AND PONTIFICATE OF ST. PETER IN ROME, W. J. D. Croke, Rome, Italy.	411
III. THE FACULTY "LARGIENDI TER IN ANNO INDULGEN- TIAM," The Editor.	421
IV. JANSENISM AND SECULARISM, The Rev. Thos. Hughes, S. J., St. Louis' University, St. Louis, Mo.	425
V. EVOLUTION OF MAN AND THE VATICAN COUNCIL, The Rev. Jos. Selinger, D.D., St. Francis' Seminary, Milwaukee, Wis.	439

## INDEX.

---

	PAGE.
A Case of Mixed Marriages . . . . .	304
A Cleric's Address to his Looking Glass, Our Reading— . . . . .	321
A Guarantee against Divorce "a Vinculo"— . . . . .	458
A. R., Members of the G.— . . . . .	71
Abstinence outside of the Confessional, Dispensation from— . . . . .	372
Address to his Looking Glass, Our Reading, A Cleric's— . . . . .	321
Ad Honorem Nominatis, De Canonicis— . . . . .	382
Administered to Catholics by Priests of the Oriental rite, Communion—	70
Administratio, Communion. Cath. Latini et Graeci Rit. . . . .	74
Adults? Can we use the form of Infant Baptism for— . . . . .	296
Aertnys, C.SS.R., Moral and Physiological Problem . . . . .	60
Against the Will of the Deceased, The Church and Cremation— . . . .	453
Allegorism and Literalism . . . . .	176
Angel in the Incense Prayer, The Name of the— . . . . .	299
Animadv. of P. Sabetti, S.J., Excisio Foetus atque ejus, etc. . . . .	65
Antiphona ad "Magnificat" in Festo B.V.M. de Lourdes— . . . . .	150
Antiphona St. Michael, Indulgentia pro— . . . . .	152
Apart from the Mass, The "Libera"— . . . . .	372
Apostolic Blessing in "Articulo Mortis," The— . . . . .	379
Arc, The Grand Inquisitor Jean Bréhal in the case of Joan— . . . . .	241
Arthur? Who is Saint— . . . . .	453
"Articulo Mortis," Confirmation in— . . . . .	145
"Articulo Mortis," The Apostolic Blessing in— . . . . .	379
Ascetic Theology (Art. XXI of Clerical Studies) . . . . .	401
Attentato, The "Impedimentum Criminis," Ex Matr.— . . . . .	71
Augustine and Evolution (Exegesis Old and New), St.— . . . . .	203
Authority, The Catholic Press and Episcopal— . . . . .	358
B. Lanuini pro Carthusianis, Concessio Officii— . . . . .	150
B. M. V. de Lourdes, Antiphona ad "Magnificat" in Festo— . . . . .	150
Baptism for Adults, Can we use the Form of Infant— . . . . .	296
Baptism of Baptists, The— . . . . .	232
Baptist, The Titular Office of St. John . . . . .	305
Baptists, The Baptism of— . . . . .	232
Bination, The Stipend in the Case of— . . . . .	460
Bishops and Parochial Schools . . . . .	465
Blessing in "Articulo Mortis," The Apostolic— . . . . .	379

	PAGE.
Brehal in the case of Joan of Arc, The Grand Inq. Jean— . . . . .	241
Can we use the form of Infant Baptism for Adults . . . . .	296
Canonicis, ad Honorem Nominatis, De— . . . . .	382
Card, Use of the Communion— . . . . .	228
Carthusianis, Concessio Officii B. Lanuini pro— . . . . .	150
Case of Bination, The Stipend in— . . . . .	460
Case of Joan of Arc, The Grand Inquisitor J. Bréhal in— . . . . .	241
Case of Mixed Marriages, A— . . . . .	304
Casus de Ectopicis Conceptibus, etc. . . . .	12, 64, 461
Casuistry in Moral Theology (Art. XVIII. of Clerical Studies) . . . . .	1
Catholic Dictionary, Our Criticism of the— . . . . .	68
Catholic Funeral Services and the Cremation of the Dead . . . . .	229, 453
Catholic Press and Episcopal Authority, The— . . . . .	358
Catholic Press, The Independence of the— . . . . .	329
Catholic Press, The Need of the— . . . . .	349
Catholic Press, Partisan Politics in the— . . . . .	343
Catholic Press, The Weak Points of the— . . . . .	117
Catholicis Latini Ritus et Orient, administr. Comm. . . . .	74
Catholicorum qui coram Ministro haeret. Matrim. contrax. etc. . . . .	467
Catholics by Priests of the Orient rite, Communion administered to L.—	70
Chasuble and White Dalmatics, Red— . . . . .	234
Church and Cremation Against the Will of the Deceased, The— . . . . .	453
Clerical Studies), Ascetic Theology, (Art. XXI of— . . . . .	401
Clerical Studies), Casuistry in Moral Theology, (Art. XVIII of— . . . . .	1
Clerical Studies, Imperfections in Our Systems of M. Theology, etc. . . . .	125
Clerical Studies), The Limitations of Moral Theology (Art. XX of— . . . . .	277
Cleric's Address to his Looking Glass, Our Reading, A— . . . . .	321
Communion Administr. to Latin Catholics by Priests of the O. R. . . . .	70
Communion Card, Use of the— . . . . .	228
Communion of Religious, Confessors and Holy— . . . . .	376
Communione Catholicis Lat. Ritus et Orient Administr. etc— . . . . .	74
Concessio Officii B. Lanuini pro Carthusianis . . . . .	150
Confessional, Dispensation from Abstinence outside— . . . . .	375
Confessors and Holy Communion of Religious . . . . .	376
Confirmation in "Articulo Mortis" . . . . .	145
Confraternitate S. Familiae, De Officio et missa, De— . . . . .	309
Confraternitat. SS. Rosarii, Convalidatio Erectionum— . . . . .	468
Confraternitatum S. Familiae, Dubia de Erectione— . . . . .	310
Congregation Stand or Kneel during the "Credo?" Should— . . . . .	449
Consultors, The Vicar General and the Diocesan— . . . . .	452
Contraxerunt, De Reconcil. Cathol. qui coram, etc.— . . . . .	467
Convalidatio Erectionum Confraternit. SS. Rosarii . . . . .	468
Coram Ministro haeretico matrimonium contrax. etc. . . . .	467
Coram SS. Sacramento, Hymni in Lingua Vernac. . . . .	311
Cosmogony, Modern Theories of . . . . .	217
Council, Evolution of Man and the Vatican— . . . . .	439

	PAGE.
"Credo?" Should the Congregation Stand or Kneel during— . . . . .	449
Cremation against the will of the Deceased, The Church and— . . . . .	453
Cremation of the Dead, Catholic Funeral Services and— . . . . .	229
Criminis, Ex Matrimonio attentato, The Impedim.— . . . . .	71
Criticism of the Catholic Dictionary, Our— . . . . .	68
Croke, William J. D.— . . . . .	411
Crucis, The Written Permit for the erection of the Via— . . . . .	72, 301
Dalmatics, Red Chasuble and White— . . . . .	234
De Canonicis ad Honorem Nominatis . . . . .	283
De Confraternitate S. Familiæ—De Off. et Missa,— . . . . .	309
De Festo S. Joseph rite Transferendo . . . . .	151
De Officio et Missa, De Confraternit. S. Familiæ— . . . . .	309
De Reconciliatione Cathol. qui coram ministro, etc. . . . .	467
De Sacra Familiæ, "The Office and Mass"— . . . . .	369
Dead, Catholic Funeral Services and the Cremation of the— . . . . .	229
Deceased, The Church and Cremation against the Will of— . . . . .	453
Decretum quoad Comm. Lat. ritus et Orient. adm. . . . .	74
Development of National Education . . . . .	255
Devotion for the Sick, The Indulgence of the Forty Hours'— . . . . .	451
Deus," and the Profess. of S. Script, in our Semin., The Encycl. "Provid. . . . .	107
Dictionary. Our Criticism of the Catholic— . . . . .	68
Different Orders, Tertiaries of— . . . . .	306
Diocesan Consultors, The Vicar General and the— . . . . .	452
Directa Occisio, A Rejoinder to the "Animadv." . . . . .	64
Discussion of a New Moral and Physiological Problem . . . . .	121
Dispensation from Abstinence outside of the Conf. . . . .	372
Divorce "a Vinculo," A Guarantee against— . . . . .	458
Dubia de Ereptione Confraternitatum S. Familiæ . . . . .	310
Dubiorum Solutio, Variorum— . . . . .	307
During the "Credo" Should the Congregation stand or kneel . . . . .	449
Ectopicis Conceptibus, Casus de— . . . . .	12, 64, 461
Editor, The . . . . .	60, 157, 241
Education, The Development of National . . . . .	255
Egan, LL.D., Maurice Francis . . . . .	349
Elenchus Festorum Primar. et Secund. (Dec. R. S. C.) . . . . .	147
Epiphany, Requiem Mass on the Feast of the— . . . . .	146
Encyclical "De Studiis Script. Sacrae," The Pontifical— . . . . .	81
Encyclical "Providentiss. Deus" and the Professors, etc. . . . .	187
Episcopal Authority, the Catholic Press and— . . . . .	358
Erection of the Via Crucis and the Written Permit, etc. . . . .	301
Erection of the "Via Crucis," The Written Permit for the— . . . . .	72
Erectione Confraternitatum S. Familiæ, Dubia De— . . . . .	310
Erectionum Confraternitat. SS. Rosarii, Convalidatio— . . . . .	468
Evolution, Exegesis Old and New, St. Augustine, etc. . . . .	203
Evolution of Man and the Vatican Council— . . . . .	439
Examination of the Junior Clergy . . . . .	463

	PAGE.
Excisio Fœtus, etc., A Rejoinder to the "Animadv." etc. . . . .	64
Exegesis Old and New, St. Augustine and Evolution— . . . . .	203
Experts, A New Moral and Phys. Problem. Reports of— . . . . .	12
Faculty "Largiendi ter in Anno Indulgentiam, The— . . . . .	421
Familiae—De Officio et Missa, De Confrat. S.— . . . . .	309
Familiae, Dubia De Ereptione Confraternit. S. . . . .	310
Familiae, Officium et Missa S.— . . . . .	384
Familia," The Office and Mass, "De Sacra— . . . . .	369
Feast of the Epiphany, Requiem Mass on the— . . . . .	146
Festo B. M. V. de Lourdes, Antiph. ad "Magnificat" in— . . . . .	150
Festo S. Joseph rite transferendo . . . . .	151
Festorum Prim. et Secund. (Dec. S.R.C.), Elenchus . . . . .	147
First Marriage Valid, Was the— . . . . .	455
Fœtus, etc., A [R]ejoinder to the "Animadver." of P. Sabetti . . . . .	65
Form of Infant Baptism for Adults, Can we use the— . . . . .	296
Forty Hours' Devotion for the Sick, The Indulg. of the— . . . . .	451
Forty Hours' Exposition, The— . . . . .	380
Funeral Services and the Cremation of the Dead, Catholic— . . . . .	229
G. A. R., Members of the— . . . . .	71
Glass, Our Reading, A Cleric's Address to His Looking . . . . .	187
Grand Inquis. Jean Brèhal in the case of Joan of Arc, The— . . . . .	241
Gregory of Nyssa and the Nebular Hypothesis, St.— . . . . .	187
Guarantee against Divorce "a Vinculo," A— . . . . .	458
Haeretico Matrimonium Contrax., De Reconcil. Cathol., qui cum . . . . .	467
Hagiography, The Name of John in— . . . . .	288
Heuser, The Rev. J. H.— . . . . .	288
High Mass without Ministers, Incense at— . . . . .	370
Hogan, D.D., The Very Rev. John— . . . . .	I, 125, 277, 401
Holaind, S. J., The Rev. R. J.,— . . . . .	12
Honorem Nominatis., De Canonicis ad— . . . . .	382
Hours' Devotion for the Sick, The Indulg. of the Forty— . . . . .	451
Hours' Exposition, The Forty— . . . . .	380
Housekeepers, A Training School for Parochial— . . . . .	136
Holy Communion of Religious, Confessors and— . . . . .	376
Holy Trinity, White Scapular of the— . . . . .	372
Hughes, The Rev. Thomas— . . . . .	255, 425
Hymni in Lingua Vernacula Coram SS. Sacramento . . . . .	311
Hypothesis, St. Gregory of Nyssa and the Nebular— . . . . .	187
"Impedimentum Criminis" Ex. Matrim. Attentato, The— . . . . .	71
Imperfections in our Systems of Moral Theol. (Art. XIX., etc.) . . . . .	125
Incense at High Mass without Ministers . . . . .	370
Incense Prayer, The Name of the Angel in the— . . . . .	299
Independence of the Catholic Press, The— . . . . .	329
Indulg. of the Forty Hours' Devotion for the Sick, The— . . . . .	451
Indulgentia pro Antiphona S. Michael— . . . . .	152
Indulgentiam," The Faculty, "Largiendi ter in anno— . . . . .	421

	PAGE.
Infant Baptism for Adults, Can we use the form of— . . . . .	296
Inquisitor J. Brèhal in the Case of Joan of Arc, etc. . . . .	241
Institute, The Proposed Martha— . . . . .	232
Jansenism and Secularism . . . . .	425
Jean Brèhal in the Case of Joan of Arc . . . . .	241
Jenkins, The Rev. Thomas Jefferson— . . . . .	136
Joan of Arc, The Grand Grand Inq. Jean Brèhal in the Case of— . . . . .	241
John the Baptist, The Titular Office of St.— . . . . .	305
John in Hagiography, The Name of— . . . . .	288
Joseph rite Transferendo, De Festo S.— . . . . .	151
Lanuini pro Carthusianis, Concess Officii B.— . . . . .	150
Latinis Cathol. by Priests of the Orient. rite, Commun. adm,— . . . . .	70
Latini Ritus et Orient Adminstr., Dec. Quoad Commer. Cath.— . . . . .	74
Lehmkuhl, S.J., and Aertnys, C.SS.R., Casus Ectopicus— . . . . .	60, 64
Libera " apart from the Mass, The "— . . . . .	372
Limitations of Moral Theol. (Art. XX of Clerical Studies) . . . . .	277
Lingua Vernacula coram SS. Sacramento, Hymni— . . . . .	311
Litaniae Sanctorum " in the Office, The "— . . . . .	371
Literalism, Allegorism and— . . . . .	176
Looking-Glass, Our Reading. A Cleric's Address to his— . . . . .	321
Lourdes, Antiphona ad "Magnificat" in Festo B.M.V. de— . . . . .	150
M.V. de Lourdes, Antiphona ad "Magnificat" B.— . . . . .	150
Magnificat" in Festo B. M. V. de Lourdes Antiph. ad "— . . . . .	150
Man and The Vatican Council, Evolution of— . . . . .	439
Marriage, A Case of Mixed— . . . . .	304
Marriage Valid?, Was the First— . . . . .	455
Marriage Valid?, Was the Second— . . . . .	458
Martha Institutes The Proposed— . . . . .	232
Mass "De Sacra Familia," the Office and— . . . . .	369
Mass on Sundays, Requiem— . . . . .	144
Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany, Requiem— . . . . .	146
Mass, The "Libera" apart from— . . . . .	372
Mass, the Rubrics of the— . . . . .	269
Mass. without Ministers, The Incense at High— . . . . .	370
Matrim Attentato, The "Impedimentum Criminis" Ex— . . . . .	71
Matrim. Contrax. De Reconcil—Cath. coram, ministro acath, etc . . . . .	467
Medical Experts, New Moral and Physiol. Problem, Reports of— . . . . .	12
Members of the G. A. R. . . . .	71
Michael, Indulgentia pro Antiphona pro S.— . . . . .	152
Ministers, Incense at High Mass without— . . . . .	370
Ministro haeretico Matrim. Contrax. De Reconcil.— . . . . .	467
Missa, De Confraternit. S. Familiae—De Officio et— . . . . .	309
Missa S. Familiae, Officium et— . . . . .	384
Mixed Marriage, A Case of— . . . . .	304
Modern Theories of Cosmogony . . . . .	217
Moral and Physiol. Problem, Reports of Medical Experts— . . . . .	12



	PAGE.
Moral Theology (Article XVIII of Clerical Studies). Casuistry in— . . .	1
Moral Theology (Article XIX of Clerical Studies), Imper. etc.— . . .	125
Moral Theology (Article XX of Clerical Studies), The limit of— . . .	277
Mortis," Confirmation in "Articulo— . . . . .	145
Mortis," the Apostolic Blessing in "Articulo— . . . . .	379
Moses and Science . . . . .	161
Name of John in Hagiography, The— . . . . .	288
National Education, The Development of— . . . . .	255
Nebular Hypothesis, St. Gregory of Nyssa and the— . . . . .	187
Need of the Catholic Press, The— . . . . .	349
New), St. Augustine and Evolution (Exegesis Old and— . . . . .	203
Nominatis, De Canonicis ad Honorem— . . . . .	382
Nominis", The Litany of the "SS — . . . . .	234
Nyssa and the Nebular Hypothesis, St. Gregory of— . . . . .	187
O'Neill, The Rev. Arthur Barry— . . . . .	269, 321
Occisio—A Rejoinder to the "Animadver." of Sabetti, S.J. . . . .	64
Office and Mass "De Sacra Familia," The— . . . . .	369
Office of St. John Baptist, The Titular . . . . .	305
Office, The "Litaniae Sanctorum" in the— . . . . .	371
Officii B. Lanuini pro Carthusianis, Concessio— . . . . .	150
Officio et Missa, De Confraternit. S. Familiae—De— . . . . .	309
Officium et Missa Sacra Familiae . . . . .	384
Old and New, St. Augustine and Evolution, Exegesis— . . . . .	203
Orders, Tertiaries of Different— . . . . .	306
Oriental Rite, Communion Adm. to Latin Catholic by Priests of— . . .	70
Orientalibus Adm., Dec. Quoad Comm. Catholic Latin. Ritus— . . .	74
Our Criticism of the Catholic Dictionary . . . . .	68
Our Reading. A Cleric's Address to his Looking-Glass . . . . .	321
Pallen, LL.D., Condé B.— . . . . .	329
Parochial House-keepers, A Training School for— . . . . .	136
Parochial Schools and Catholic Bishops, . . . . .	465
Partisan Politics in the Catholic Press . . . . .	343
Permit for the Erection of the "Via Crucis," The Written— . . .	72, 301
Perpetual Presence and Pontificate of St. Peter in Rome, The— . . .	411
Peter in Rome, The Perpetual Presence and Pontificate of St.— . . .	411
Physiol. Problem, Reports of Medical Experts, The Moral and— . . .	12
Points of Our Catholic Press, The Weak— . . . . .	343
Politics in the Catholic Press, Partisan— . . . . .	343
Pontifical Encycl. "De Studies Scripturae S," The— . . . . .	81
Pontificate of St. Peter in Rome, The Perpetual presence and— . . .	411
Prayer, The Name of the Angel in the Incense— . . . . .	299
Presence and Pontificate of St. Peter in Rome, The Perpetual— . . .	411
Press and Episcopal Authority, The Catholic— . . . . .	358
Press, Partisan Politics in the Catholic— . . . . .	343
Press, The Independence of the Catholic— . . . . .	329
Press, The Need of the Catholic— . . . . .	349

	PAGE
Press, The Weak Points of the Catholic . . . . .	117
Priests of the Oriental rite, Communion to L. Cath. by— . . . . .	70
Primar. et Secund. (Dec. S. R. C.), Elenchus Festorum— . . . . .	147
Problem—Reports of Med. Experts—, New Moral and Phys.— . . . . .	12
Professors of S. Script., The Encyclical “Provident Deus” and— . . . . .	107
Proposed Martha Institute . . . . .	232
Providentissimus Deus” and the Professors of S. Scripture, The “— . . . . .	157
R., Members of the G. A.— . . . . .	71
Reading. A Cleric’s Address to his Looking Glass., Our— . . . . .	321
Reconciliatione Cath. qui coram ministro haeret. Matr. Contrax . . . . .	467
Red Chasuble and White Dalmatics . . . . .	234
Reilly, L. W.— . . . . .	117
Rejoinder to the “Animadvers.” of P. Sabetti, S.J. . . . .	64
Religious, Confessors and Holy Communion of— . . . . .	376
Remedies (Art. XIX of C. S.), Imperf. in our Systems of Mor. Theol. . . . .	125
Reports of Med. Experts., Moral and Physiol. Prob.— . . . . .	12
Requiem Mass on Sundays . . . . .	144
Requiem Mass on the Feast of the Epiphany . . . . .	146
Rite., Comm. adm. to Latin Cath. by Priests of the Oriental— . . . . .	70
Rite, transferendo., De Festo S. Joseph— . . . . .	151
Ritus Orient. Admin., Dec. quod Comm. Cath. Latini— . . . . .	74
Rosarii., Convalidatio Erectonium Confraternit. SS.— . . . . .	468
Rubrics of the Mass . . . . .	269
S. Joseph rite Transferendo., De Festo— . . . . .	151
S. Michael., Indulgentia pro Antiphona— . . . . .	152
SS. Nominis.,” The Litany of the “— . . . . .	234
SS. Rosarii., Convalidatio Erectionum Confrat.— . . . . .	468
SS. Gregory of Nyssa and the Nebular Hypothesis . . . . .	187
St. John Baptist, The Titular Office of— . . . . .	305
St. Peter in Rome., The Perpetual Presence and Pontificate of— . . . . .	411
Sabetti, S.J., De Solutione Casus Ectopici . . . . .	64
Sacra Familia.,” The Office and Mass “De— . . . . .	368
Sacrae Familiae., Dubia de Erectione Confraternit.— . . . . .	310
Sacrae Familiae., Officium et Missa— . . . . .	384
Sacramento., Hymni in Lingua Vernacula coram SS.— . . . . .	311
Saint Arthur., Who is—? . . . . .	453
Sanctorum” in the Office., The “Litaniae— . . . . .	371
Sanctissimo Sacramento., Hymni in Lingua V. coram.— . . . . .	311
Scapular of the Holy Trinity., White— . . . . .	372
School for Parochial House-Keepers., A Training— . . . . .	136
Scripture., The Encyclical “Provid. Deus” and Professors— . . . . .	107
Scripturae Sacrae.,” The Pontifical Encycl. “De Studiis . . . . .	81
Second Marriage Valid? Was the— . . . . .	455
Secularism., Jansenism and— . . . . .	425
Secundariorum ; (Dec. S. R. C.), Elenchus Fest. Prim. et— . . . . .	147
Selinger, D.D., The Rev. Jos.— . . . . .	439

	PAGE
Seminaries., The Encycl. "Provid. Deus" and the Professors in—	107
Service and the Cremation of the Dead., Cath. Funeral—	229
Should the Congregation stand or kneel at the "Credo." . . . . .	449
Sick., The Indulgence of the Forty Hours' Devotion for the—	451
Smith., The Rev. John Talbot—	343
Solutio Variorum Dubiorum . . . . .	307
Solutions offered by P. P. Lehmkuhl and Aertnys., The—	60
Stand or Kneel during the "Credo.", Should the Congr.—	449
Stipend in the Case of Bination., The—	460
Studies), Ascetic Theology (Art. XXI of Clerical—	401
Studies), Imperfections in Our System of, etc. (Clerical—	125
Studies), The Limitat. Moral Theol. (Art. XX of Clerical—	277
Studiis Scripturae Sacrae.," Pontifical Encycl. "De—	81
Sundays, Requiem Mass on—	144
Systems of Moral Theol. and Remedies. (Art. XIX of C. S.)	125
Ter in Anno Indulgentiam.," The Faculty "Largiendi—	421
Tertiaries of Different Orders . . . . .	306
Theology (Art. XVIII of C. S.), Casuistry in Moral—	1
Theology (Art. XIX of C. S.), Imperfections, etc. . . . .	125
Theology (Art. XX of C. S.), The Limitations of Moral—	277
Theology (Art. XXI of C. S.), Ascetic—	401
Theories of Cosmogony., Modern—	217
Titular Office of St. John Baptist., The—	305
Training School for Parochial House-Keepers . . . . .	236
Transferendo., De Festo S. Joseph's rite—	151
Trinity., White Scapular of the Holy—	372
Use of the Communion Card . . . . .	288
Use the form of Infant Baptism for Adults? Can we—	296
V. de Lourdes., Antiphona ad "Magnificat" in Festo B. M.—	150
Valid?, Was the First Marriage—	455
Valid?, Was the Second Marriage—	458
Variorum Dubiorum Solutio . . . . .	307
Vatican Council., Evolution of Man and the—	439
Via Crucis and the Written Permit., Once More—	301
Via Crucis," The Written Permit for the Erection of the "—	72
Vicar General and the Diocesan Counsultors., The—	452
Vinculo," A Guarantee against Divorce "a—	458
Was the First Marriage Valid? . . . . .	455
Was the Second Marriage Valid? . . . . .	458
Weak Points of the Catholic Press, The—	117
White Dalmatics, Red Chasuble and—	234
Who is Saint Arthur? . . . . .	453
Will of the Deceased, The Church and Cremation Against—	453
Without Ministers, Incense at High Mass—	370
Written Permit for the Erection of the "Via Crucis" . . . . .	72, 301
Zahm, C.S.C., The Rev. J. A.—	161, 176, 187, 203, 217

## BOOK REVIEW.

	PAGE.
Announced, Indian and White—: Palladino . . . . .	318
Aranjo Gama : Biblia das Escolas . . . . .	478
Aristoteles Lexicon : Kappes . . . . .	158
Armory of Holy Scripture : Vaughan . . . . .	159
Biblia das Escolas : Mey—Aranjo Gama . . . . .	478
Biblical Geography : Hurlbut-Vincent . . . . .	156
Buckler : The Perfection of Man by Charity . . . . .	397
Canonique dans causes Matrim., Code de Proced.—: Peries . . . . .	396
Carmina Mariana : Orby Shipley . . . . .	398
Cathrein : Moral Philosophie . . . . .	75
Charity, The Perfection of Man by—: Buckler . . . . .	397
Christ in Type and Prophecy : Maas . . . . .	234
Christian Philosophy : Poissy . . . . .	76
Church Directories . . . . .	319
Code de Procedure Canon. d. Causes Matrim.: Peries . . . . .	396
Data of Modern Ethics : Ming . . . . .	468
Deutschen Volkes, Vol. VII., Geschichte d.—: Jannsen-Pastor . . . . .	312
Directories, Church— . . . . .	319
Dogma of Purgatory, The—: Schouppe . . . . .	78
Dogmaticae Questiones : Schmid . . . . .	153
Donovan—Morozzo—: A Treatise on Spiritual Life . . . . .	237
Establishment of Scholarships in Parishes . . . . .	79
Ethics, The Date of Modern—: Ming . . . . .	468
Ethics, Fundamental—: Poland . . . . .	468
Five Minute Sermons : Paulists . . . . .	156
Frick : Ontologia . . . . .	468
Fundamental Ethics : Poland . . . . .	468
Geography, Biblical—: Hurlbut-Vincent . . . . .	156
Geschichte d. Deutschen Volkes, Vol. VII. : Jannsen-Pastor— . . . . .	312
Graves of Ireland : Lecky . . . . .	398
Haan : Philosophia Naturalis . . . . .	468
Hartmann : Religion or no Religion . . . . .	477
Holy Scripture, Armory of—: Vaughan . . . . .	159
Indian and White (Announced) : Palladino . . . . .	318
Ireland, Graves of—: Lecky . . . . .	398
Jannsen-Pastor : Geschichte d. Deutschen Volkes, Vol. VII . . . . .	312
Kindly Light, Lead—: Taunton . . . . .	153
Kappes : Aristoteles Lexicon . . . . .	158
Know-Knothingism, The New—: Ryan . . . . .	477
Lead Kindly Light : Taunton . . . . .	153
Lecky : Graves of Ireland . . . . .	398
Lexicon, Aristoteles—: Kappes . . . . .	158
Life, A Treatise of Spiritual—: Morozzo-Donovan . . . . .	237
Light, Lead Kindly : Taunton . . . . .	153

	PAGE.
Lubbermann-Schuech : The Priest in the Pulpit . . . . .	316
Manual for the Sick . . . . .	477
Maas : Christ in Type and Prophecy . . . . .	235
Man by Charity, The Perfection of—: Buckler . . . . .	397
Mariana, Carmina—: Orby Shipley . . . . .	398
Matrimoniales, Code de Procedure Canon, etc.: Peries . . . . .	396
Media—Scientia : Zigon . . . . .	475
Mey : Biblia Portug . . . . .	478
Ming : The Data of Modern Ethics . . . . .	468
Minute Sermons, Five—: Paulists . . . . .	153
Modern Ethics, The Data of—: Ming . . . . .	468
Moral Philosophie : Cathrein . . . . .	75
Morozzo-Donovan : A Treatise of Spiritual Life . . . . .	237
Naturalis-Philosophia : Haan . . . . .	468
New Know-Knothingism : Ryan . . . . .	477
Ontologia : Frick . . . . .	468
Orby Shipley : Carmina Mariana . . . . .	398
Palladino : Indian and White (Announced) . . . . .	318
Parishes, The Establishment of Scholarships in— . . . . .	79
Pastor-Jannsen : Geschichte d. Deutschen Volkes, Vol. VII . . . . .	312
Paulists : Five Minute Sermons . . . . .	153
Pax Vobiscum : Manual for the Sick . . . . .	477
Perfection of Man by Charity, The—: Buckler. . . . .	397
Peries : Code de Procedure Canonique, etc. . . . .	396
Philosophia Naturalis : Haan . . . . .	468
Philosophie, Moral—: Cathrein . . . . .	75
Philosophy, Christian—: Poissy . . . . .	76
Poissy : Christian Philosophy . . . . .	76
Poland : Rational Philosophy . . . . .	468
Poland : Fundamental Ethics . . . . .	468
Priest in the Pulpit : Schuech-Lubbermann . . . . .	316
Procedure Canon d. causes Matrim., Code de—: Peries . . . . .	397
Prophecy., Christ in Type and—: Maas . . . . .	235
Pulpit, The Priest in the—: Schuech-Lubbermann . . . . .	315
Purgatory, The Dogma of—: Schouppe . . . . .	78
Questiones Dogmaticae : Schmid . . . . .	153
Rational Philosophy : Poland . . . . .	468
Ryan : The New Know-Nothingism . . . . .	477
Religion or No Religion : Hartmann . . . . .	477
Schmid : Questiones Dogmaticae . . . . .	153
Scholarships in Parishes., The Establishment of— . . . . .	79
Schouppe : The Dogma of Purgatory . . . . .	78
Schuech-Lubbermann : The Priest in the Pulpit . . . . .	316
Scientia Media : Zigon . . . . .	475
Scripture, Armory of Holy : Vaughan . . . . .	159
Sermons, Five Minute : Paulists . . . . .	156

	PAGE
Shiple, Orby— : Carmina Mariana . . . . .	396
Sick, Manual for the— . . . . .	477
Spiritual Life, A Treatise of— : Morozzo-Donovan . . . . .	237
Taunton : Lead kindly Light . . . . .	153
Treatise of Spiritual Life, A— : Morozzo-Donovan . . . . .	237
Type and Prophecy, Christ in— : Maas . . . . .	235
Vincent-Hurlbut : Biblical Geography . . . . .	156
Volkes VII, Geschichte d. Deutschen— : Jannsen-Pastor . . . . .	312
White (Announced), Indian and— : Palladino . . . . .	318
Zigon : De Scientia Media . . . . .	475











GETTY CENTER LINRARY



3 3125 00676 3755

